

North Comments

Name: Ian Oldroyd

Representor No: PRS04535 **Representation ID:** REP00304

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Green land is irreplaceable. Once built upon it is lost forever. Why must we build on green land at all when there is enough brown land in Hunslet alone to build a town the size of Otley. There are other areas of Leeds with more brown land (Holbeck for instance) and thousands of empty properties which could and should be refurbished and brought back into use.

Question Ref: H2

Site 2055 is Carr Manor at Meanwood and during the current review has been identified as a potential site for fifteen dwellings. Although I have been assured that this it is highly unlikely that this would happen I am deeply concerned that Carr Manor and its grounds should ever be included in such a review. I am equally concerned that the vast majority of the people of Leeds are completely unaware of this current review. I am also deeply concerned about the allotments adjacent to Carr Manor. Although these are currently designated as a protected green space I am aware that this designation can be changed. This area of Leeds is already below the recommended allotments per 1000 people.

Question Ref: H3

Cannot answer

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Until there is no brown land left in Leeds and no empty properties there is no reason to build houses anywhere but on used land

Question Ref: H5

No answer

Question Ref: H6

No answer

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

All or public amenity arable land

Question Ref: H8

None

Question Ref: H9

No answer

Question Ref: H10

No answer

Question Ref: H11

No answer

Question Ref: H12

No

Question Ref: H13

No

Question Ref: H14

No answer

Question Ref: H15

no answer

North Comments

Name: Ian Oldroyd

Representor No: PRS04535 **Representation ID:** REP00304

Question Ref: General comment
No

North Comments

Name: Rachel Olijnyk

Representor No: PRS06323 **Representation ID:** REP07265

Question Ref: H1

I would like to place an objection to the proposal to build 25 properties on The Paddock, Church Lane, Meanwood/Moortown (1242). I live opposite this land on Church Grove and it would be a shame for the land to be sold to builders to turn into a housing estate as the paddock makes the area a greener more pleasant space in a suburb that is already very built up.

>>

Furthermore I would be concerned about the increase in traffic the estate would bring to an already congested road. I have raised concerns with the local police at how fast cars travel down this road previously with people using it as a cut through to the ring road or to waitrose, and a new housing estate would only make matters worse.

>>>

I would appreciate it if you could take my objections into consideration when making the planning decision.

North Comments

Name: Suzanne Oliver

Representor No: PRS01255 **Representation ID:** REP03359

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Paul Edward Oliver

Representor No: PRS01496 **Representation ID:** REP03635

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments- Strongly agree.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem- Strongly agree.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly Agree.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this- Strongly agree.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: B O'neil

Representor No: PRS00319 Representation ID: REP02262

Question Ref: H7

1178B - I would like to object to the council's designation of the above site which is currently green for the following reasons: [[[Site is designated as red - put comment as agreed with designation]]]

1.Increase in the volume of traffic on Long Causeway especially during rush hours.Long traffic queue is already a problem here and any further increase to this will only add to the chaos not to mention the atmospheric pollution caused by traffic jams.

2.Local amenities-our local gp surgery and the local schools are stretched to the limit in terms of capacity.Any further increase to their burden,especially to the gp surgery will cause untold misery to the adel community.

Due to a number of developments taking place in the Adel area on Brownfield sites i would suggest that the above site be put back towards the end of the plan post 2020.

North Comments

Name: B O'neil

Representor No: PRS00319 **Representation ID:** REP05080

Question Ref: H1

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: B O'neil

Representor No: PRS00319 Representation ID: REP05080

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: B O'neil

Representor No: PRS00319 Representation ID: REP05080

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: B O'neil

Representor No: PRS00319 **Representation ID:** REP05080

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: B O'neil

Representor No: PRS00319 Representation ID: REP05080

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site 1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: B O'neil

Representor No: PRS00319 Representation ID: REP05080

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: B O'neil

Representor No: PRS00319 **Representation ID:** REP05080

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Sue Orson

Representor No: PRS01227 **Representation ID:** REP03330

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Nick Orson

Representor No: PRS01228 **Representation ID:** REP03332

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Gareth Osborne

Representor No: PRS03843 Representation ID: REP01410

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H2

1002; 1080; 3367A; All the above sites are within the Greenbelt and in or very near a conservation area. The allocation of housing in these sites represents an excessive allocation of housing relative to the size of the village (500+ houses in a village with only 1400 houses). This huge increase in houses will place significant strain on already burgeoning infrastructure. Will the drainage system cope with this significant increase in housing. As Bramhope and surrounding (Otley, Adel, Pool etc) areas do not have rail facilities the use of the road network is all the more. The Otley road through Bramhope is already a very busy road and presents a real risk for school children crossing the road. If the scheme including the building of a by-pass, that would obviously help the traffic through Bramhope, albeit not the traffic into Leeds. The demand for local amenities such as the school (which is already over-subscribed), the shops and the local pub would also significantly increase. We don't have local restaurants / cafes or supermarkets in Bramhope. Would the additional scheme lead to the building of these? I understand there may be more suitable areas, closer to the city centre, which would have significantly less impact on the greenbelt and that are currently marked in red (such as 1299B, 2052, 1178B, 2058, 1019). I also question whether the sewage infrastructure is sufficiently robust to cope with the extra demand.

Question Ref: H3

sites 1080, 1002 and 3367A should be re-coded red - unsuitable, due to the reasons outlined in H2

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

sites 1080, 1002 and 3367A should be re-coded red - unsuitable due to the reasons outlined in H2

Question Ref: H5

sites 1080, 1002 and 3367A should be re-coded red - unsuitable due to the reasons outlined in H2

Question Ref: H6

sites 1080, 1002 and 3367A should be re-coded red - unsuitable due to the reasons outlined in H2

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

sites such as 1299B, 2052, 1178B, 2058, 1019 appear more suitable for construction than other sites which have been classified such as those outlined in H2

Question Ref: H8

sites such as 1299B, 2052, 1178B, 2058, 1019 appear more suitable for construction than other sites which have been classified such as those outlined in H2

Question Ref: H9

see response to H2

Question Ref: H10

see response to H2 - sites such as 1299B, 2052, 1178B, 2058, 1019 appear more suitable for construction than other sites which have been classified such as those outlined in H2

North Comments

Name: Ian & Sally O'toole

Representor No: PRS06063 **Representation ID:** REP06908

Question Ref: H7

1079, 1243, 1246 - supports red

The Respondents fully support the decision of Leeds City Council to identify sites ref. 1079, 1243 and 1246 as 'red sites' within its 'traffic light' system, and to conclude that none are considered suitable as potential housing allocations. However, for the reasons set out in the above appraisal, it is considered that in addressing and balancing the various issues, insufficient weight has been placed on a number of factors, notably:

- the difficulties that are inherent in considering the possibility of mitigation measures to address the disadvantages of the sites in terms of their relationships with public transport services and other key facilities:

- the harm that allocations would cause in terms of the purposes of the Green Belt, and to its key characteristics of openness and permanence
- the significant harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (a designated heritage asset) as a result of (a) development primarily within its very recently extended boundary (b) the need to remove extensive lengths of walls and trees in order to provide a satisfactory access, and (c) the resultant harm that would be caused to the historic pavement adjacent to Long Causeway.
- the significant harm that would be caused to the setting of the Church of St John the Baptist (a Grade 1 listed building) and the interruption of key views of the church from within the Conservation Area; and
- the significant harm that would be caused to the designated Urban Green Corridor, both as a result of its reduction in size following development within it and as a result of the loss of a green lung extending into the urban area from the wider countryside.

In such circumstances, the Council is asked (a) to conclude that the allocation of any or all of the site in question would cause significant harm, contrary to national and local policy guidance (b) to retain the 'red' designation as currently applied to each of the sites and to resist any suggestion that they should be considered as suitable potential housing allocations. Should any further re-appraisal be required, or should the existing assessments be reviewed, the Council is asked to have regard to the issues raised in this submission, and to maintain its current position.

For further comments/information, see full representation.

North Comments

Name: Julie Owens

Representor No: PRS02166 **Representation ID:** REP04391

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree No infrastructure here to support it The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree This road is busy enough as we are Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Christopher Owens

Representor No: PRS02488 **Representation ID:** REP04758

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom Green to Red. Strongly agree Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

North Comments

Name: James Owens

Representor No: PRS02489 Representation ID: REP04759

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom Green to Red. Strongly agree Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Number of foxes on the streets & kites hunting above gardens prove their natural habitats have already been impeded upon.

North Comments

Name: Sue And John Oxley

Representor No: PRS05617 **Representation ID:** REP06276

Question Ref: H7

It is our understanding that Planning Officers at Leeds City Council have listed the above sites as 'unsuitable for development'.

We are writing to say that we completely agree with this decision and commend the Planning Officers.

There are so many existing brown field sites which could be used for future development. It is very important for the area to retain its rural feel and have green belt areas for the community's enjoyment and pleasure.

Building new large scale developments near to the airport must also be questionable in relation to noise and safety issues.

We understand that there is an application for a small scale restoration project of listed buildings at Ling Bob which is a separate issue to mass development of the area and we see no reason to oppose this.

North Comments

Name: Sharan Packer

Representor No: PRS03352 Representation ID: REP01671

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Site ref 1199. Land off Moseley Wood Gardens. This area is not suitable for housing. See next section for reasons.

Question Ref: H2

Site 1199 Land off Moseley Wood Gardens. There is insufficient infrastructure to support a housing development of the size anticipated. There is already insufficient infrastructure to support the existing housing in Cookridge. The local schools have insufficient capacity for children currently living in Cookridge. The roads are not sufficient to handle the increase in cars - some extra 1000 journeys per day. The area is the lowest point and subject to flooding which overflows onto the railway tracks thereby disrupting train services. There is insufficient capacity on the trains for people living in the area to use them to travel to Leeds. At peak time trains cannot pick up all the passengers who wish to travel from Horsforth and there are currently no plans to increase the number of carriages. Bus services in the area are very poor. The inadequacy of the public transport system in the area and the consequent reliance on cars is neither environmentally or socially sustainable. The A660 into Leeds is already overcongested from the ringroad through headingley and into the city centre and the extra 400 or so cars per day that would be using the road should the development go ahead is unsustainable and would lead to grid lock on many roads. There will be increased difficulty in getting into and out of Cookridge for exiting households especially during the winter. The weather in Cookridge in winter is always worse than elsewhere in Leeds with roads often blocked by snow and buses stopping at the ring road. There is inadequate snow clearing by the council at present with Cookridge "abandoned" to the elements for days/weeks. Access to the site is very difficult and the roads are narrow and not suitable for the heavy goods vehicles that would be associated with any development. It is understood that the development would take 6 years to complete. The reason for this is not known but it is an excessive time to have the constant disruption of heavy plant and machinery through residential areas. The access in to the site is narrow and the heavy vehicles would do excessive damage to the roads which are already in a very poor state with their substructure breaking up. The extra weight would lead to much more failure and slippage of roads because of the steep gradients in places. In short the infrastructure and amenities in Cookridge are already struggling to cope with existing housing and are not able to support the additional housing. There is also the loss of wildlife habitat to consider. The area around the beck is a wildlife refuge and provides a green corridor for wildlife from the surrounding area. Any building would cause significant detriment to wildlife especially given the proposed length of time any development would take. There has been a lot of conservation work carried out in the area over the last 20 years by local land owners and any development would be detrimental to this.

Question Ref: H3

Site 1151 land off Cookridge Lane. This site although on the edge of the green belt does not have the problems of access that site 1199 does. It has access off a main road so heavy goods vehicles would not need to travel through built up residential areas to access the site. It is also less prone to flooding and would not have the knock on effects on the railway line that the Moseley Wood site has. Site 3044 and 3360 Cookridge Hall. Both these sites would make a sufficiently large development area to create a new "village" with sufficient space to provide the necessary infrastructure to support such a development. This would include schools, shops, doctors and dentists etc. All three of the above sites are at a higher elevation in terms of flooding but there is still the winter weather issues to deal with as well as the increased traffic flow along Otley Road. The land in this area is also used as arable land and there would not be a significant detrimental effect on wildlife in the area (unlike development at Moseley Wood Gardens).

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Site references 1151, 3044, 3360. These sites could be allocated for housing instead of site 1199. As they are much more accessible and would not cause the same amount of disruption to Cookridge residents as the site off Moseley Wood Gardens. There would however still be the issue of sufficient infrastructure in terms of roads, public transport etc but the much larger sites would mean that there should be space to build these facilities.

Question Ref: H8

Site references 1151, 3044, 3360. These sites, including the golf course would allow two main access roads, Otley Old Road and Otley Road. Please see other comments supporting the move from red to green under H7 above and H3 above.

Question Ref: H9

Site 1199 Land off Moseley Wood Gardens should have been colour coded red because of the difficulties with access the topography, the lack of infrastructure and amenities to support the development, the effect on wildlife and the rail link from flooding run off.

Question Ref: H12

No

North Comments

Name: Philip Packer

Representor No: PRS03976 Representation ID: REP01901

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

The areas I am concerned about are open field sites that currently provide a green heartery into the urban sprawl. There development I believe would be to the detriment of the city when I am led to believe ther are brown filed sites in the city that could be developed before these areas.

Question Ref: H2

Site 1199 Land off Moseley Wood Gardens.1. Further development of the area to the extent of a further 200-300 properties as planned would put a great strain on the current road network . The site can only be reached via narrow urban type roads, a development on this scale would I suggest add at least a further 500plus vehicles onto the roads . The minor roads would become ratruns for commuting vehicles from the estate with all there inherent problems.2. The site is in a low lying area. Cookridge is one of the highest areas of the city and we have problems in the estate during the winter when it snows. The current street where I live cannot be entered when it snows and this will be one of the routes into the estate. Where will all the vehicles on the new estate be left when it snows, on the main routes causing severe congestion problems.3. Being in a depression the site is the natural run off for water from the surrounding streets and gardens. Further development would further add to the problem, the beck ajoining would not be able to cope with further rain run off leading to flooding of the railway link from Leeds to Harrogate.4. Schools, the local primary school I have been informed is full to capacity no provision is being made to increase the size of the school so the site is not suitable as I would suggest most new house owners would have young families.5. I have been informed by a local gp that they cannot increase the size of there surgery, therefore there would be no local medical cover for the development. 6. The rail link into the city provides little in the way of parking for those commuting into the city at present. A further increase in the size of Cookridge without development of the rail structure would cause huge problems in the area of the station as present parking in adjoining streets is full to capacity.7. Development of the site will result in one of the few green areas between the city and the airport being lost and will result in further urban sprawl out of the city when there are areas within the present city limits that could be developed remaining empty.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

land at rear of Cookridge Avenue could be developed before the MoselyWood site as it would have a ready access onto a main road route.

North Comments

Name: Wendy Padden

Representor No: PRS05703 Representation ID: REP06369

Question Ref: H7

In particular Site 1310 Land at Outwood Lane, Horsforth (listed as not, suitable for allocation of housing)

For your information as a local resident living on Jackman Drive, off Outwood Lane, I wish to strongly agree with the LCCs classification of this site ie not suitable.

This would be on the grounds for the following reasons;

Highway safety - Preventing an increase in yet more traffic on Outwood Lane. Already used as a 'rat run', by all kinds of vehicles, dangerous to both pedestrians and other drivers.

Protecting green open space, which is being reduced at an alarming rate in the area. I know this area which is planning to be built upon and is very valued by local residents - ie enjoyed greatly by children/families and dog walkers and being able to enjoy the local wildlife.

Protecting trees, birds and numerous fauna/wildlife.

Maintaining the character of our local community, which is very valued within the area and I know is supported by Horsforth Town Council.

Saying no more to the amount of planning applications within the local area, which is very alarming regarding the ever increasing number of them.

Concern over emergency vehicles ie police, fire and ambulance service being able to access Outwood Lane, in the event of the proposed houses being built.

Historical significance - ie the number of large stone houses within this area, such a development would destroy the character of the area.

Availability of unused local brown field sites not being fully used.

North Comments

Name: Nicholas Page

Representor No: PRS05260 **Representation ID:** REP05854

Question Ref: H4

Dear Leeds City Council

I am writing today to disagree with the building of 185 houses on site 1202.

- The access to this area is limited to say the least
- The traffic flow would be increased significantly, a danger as so many young children live on Victoria Avenue
- Newliathes Primary would not be able to receive the increased demand in numbers
- As houses have already been approved on site 731 – shouldn't another site be considered? Why should the residents of Victoria Avenue suffer all the inconveniences of such a major build on top of the 15 houses already agreed?

Kind regards

[x]

North Comments

Name: Pat Page

Representor No: PRS05689 Representation ID: REP06354

Question Ref: H7

I write with reference to 1310 Land at Outwood Lane, Horsforth. I agree with the Council's classification that this land is not suitable for the allocation of housing. This is due to many factors including dangerous access to the land, the congestion on Outwood Lane and the ecology of the land and its surrounding areas.

North Comments

Name: Helen Panks

Representor No: PRS03172 Representation ID: REP01359

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

It would be better to use brown field sites first rather than building on the green belt.

Question Ref: H2

Site 1199 Access to site is very limitedThe site is prone to flooding and drains onto nearby rail trackThe volume of traffic will be significantly increased in the area and the local roads cannot support thisFamily housing will mean more children requiring school places, the local schools are already oversubscribedThe site is really a green belt site and should never have been removed from PAS

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H12

No

Question Ref: H13

No

North Comments

Name: Andy Panks

Representor No: PRS03804 Representation ID: REP01374

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Brown field sites should be allocated first before building houses on new virgin ground.

Question Ref: H2

Site Ref 1199.Lack of local amenities, ie. no shops, dentists, doctors etc.Already over subscribed primary schools in area, nearest primary school, is not under direct LEA control.Already have had Horsforth High school removed as an option for this area due to its recent changes in its admissions policy (LS18 post code has a priority).Lack of access, cars for the additional 200 houses would have to enter/exit through already busy estate roads. Abundance of cars already in current estate often causes roads to become blocked.Proposed new estate with only one entrance, would be like a 200 house cul-de-sac. The area is naturally wet, with several becks flowing through it and is very prone to flooding. Additional building will only make this worse.Adding an additional 200 homes in this site would ruin the nice peaceful nature of this area, effecting all the current local residents.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

North Comments

Name: M Pannett

Representor No: PRS01037 Representation ID: REP03082

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Ea & Jw Papworth-smith

Representor No: PRS02696 Representation ID: REP05152

Question Ref: H1

I wish to raise strong objections to the proposals made for development in Adel. You will no doubt receive strong and lengthy arguments so I shall be brief, giving key points only: -

1.I can not find an appropriate needs assessment. Where is it please? This would not doubt address:-

a.What will be done to address poor road and transport infrastructure. The tram proposals etc will not do so. Eu submitted information?

b.Why are brownfield site options not deemed appropriate?

c. Why is so much property in Leeds unoccupied ?

d.As we cover over land what are long term ecological impacts and how are they being planned for? You will appreciate better than I this goes far beyond local matters

e.How are the absence of local amenities, especially for young families, to be addressed?

f.What is the justifications for the type of housing given the national need and those of Leeds?

The furnishing of an answer to the above would interest many and allow clarity of debate. Currently the argument seems based on coincidence, greed and absences of committed thought process.

Question Ref: H7

I wish to raise strong objections to the proposals made for development in Adel. You will no doubt receive strong and lengthy arguments so I shall be brief, giving key points only: -

1.I can not find an appropriate needs assessment. Where is it please? This would not doubt address:-

a.What will be done to address poor road and transport infrastructure. The tram proposals etc will not do so. Eu submitted information?

b.Why are brownfield site options not deemed appropriate?

c. Why is so much property in Leeds unoccupied ?

d.As we cover over land what are long term ecological impacts and how are they being planned for? You will appreciate better than I this goes far beyond local matters

e.How are the absence of local amenities, especially for young families, to be addressed?

f.What is the justifications for the type of housing given the national need and those of Leeds?

The furnishing of an answer to the above would interest many and allow clarity of debate. Currently the argument seems based on coincidence, greed and absences of committed thought process.

North Comments

Name: Ann Parker

Representor No: PRS03318 **Representation ID:** REP01926

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I can understand most of the reasons put forward for the use of the green sites. These involve quite a lot of green belt, but in my opinion they are closer to Leeds and as such would not add to the traffic congestion until we get further down the A65.

Question Ref: H3

2038 is coded amber, but is Brownfield. The fact that it would require remedial works before a residential use could be considered should not make so much difference. Surely the profit margins of the builders aren't the issue here. Brownfield should be considered before any scrap of greenbelt is used. After all Brownfield has already been developed, but once built on you will never get green belt back.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: H6

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H8

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H9

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

North Comments

Name: Ann Parker

Representor No: PRS03318 **Representation ID:** REP01926

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area.I have submitted them as my own, as I agree with them entirely.Ann Parker

North Comments

Name: Glenn Parker

Representor No: PRS03441 Representation ID: REP00144

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

Although most of us are against building on green belt, if due to government targets for housing we have to build, these sites have the least impact on the surrounding countryside from further encroachment. They give the best prevention to sprawl of built up areas. These sites reduce merge of neighbouring towns .Delighted to see The Billing and surrounding fields has been protected from development. This would have been a disaster for urban sprawl,loss of countryside, not to mention loss of wildlife ,loss of a well used amenity,and an area of outstanding beauty. Thankyou.

Question Ref: H2

As we have to have some building in Rawdon its difficult to say where to build but the only site I have reservations with is site 3329 which must be upsetting for residents down Layton Lane.This is still on green belt and encroaching on the countryside so would have liked an alternative brownfield site instead .Thankyou

Question Ref: H3

no

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

see H2

Question Ref: H6

no

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

seeH1

Question Ref: H8

seeH2

Question Ref: H9

seeH2

Question Ref: H10

no

Question Ref: H11

no

Question Ref: H12

no

Question Ref: H13

no

Question Ref: H14

unknown

Question Ref: H15

unknown

Question Ref: General comment

Thank you for listening to my opinions please consider them and have a nice day . Regards Glenn Parker

North Comments

Name: Kevin Parker

Representor No: PRS04656 **Representation ID:** REP01922

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I can understand most of the reasons put forward for the use of the green sites. These involve quite a lot of green belt, but in my opinion they are closer to Leeds and as such would not add to the traffic congestion until we get further down the A65.

Question Ref: H3

2038 is coded amber, but is Brownfield. The fact that it would require remedial works before a residential use could be considered should not make so much difference. Surely the profit margins of the builders aren't the issue here. Brownfield should be considered before any scrap of greenbelt is used. After all Brownfield has already been developed, but once built on you will never get green belt back.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: H6

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H8

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H9

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

North Comments

Name: Kevin Parker

Representor No: PRS04656 **Representation ID:** REP01922

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area. I have submitted them as my own, as I agree with them entirely. Kevin Parker

North Comments

Name: Sarah Park

Representor No: PRS01420 **Representation ID:** REP03549

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. I feel there is no need for building at the proposed site, the environment will be badly damaged. In addition, the only exit routes come out either side of the school. In addition, there is insufficient infrastructure to deal with the demand these homes will bring. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: J S A Parry

Representor No: PRS02639 **Representation ID:** REP05084

Question Ref: H1

- 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: J S A Parry

Representor No: PRS02639 Representation ID: REP05084

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: J S A Parry

Representor No: PRS02639 Representation ID: REP05084

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: J S A Parry

Representor No: PRS02639 **Representation ID:** REP05084

Question Ref: H1

- 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

- 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: J S A Parry

Representor No: PRS02639 Representation ID: REP05084

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: J S A Parry

Representor No: PRS02639 Representation ID: REP05084

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: J S A Parry

Representor No: PRS02639 **Representation ID:** REP05084

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 — LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Francine Passmore

Representor No: PRS01211 **Representation ID:** REP03314

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Ian Passmore

Representor No: PRS01254 **Representation ID:** REP03358

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Praful Patel

Representor No: PRS01319 Representation ID: REP03421

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Prafful Patel

Representor No: PRS01319 Representation ID: REP03421

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Prafful Patel

Representor No: PRS01319 Representation ID: REP03421

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: Praful Patel

Representor No: PRS01319 Representation ID: REP03421

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Prafful Patel

Representor No: PRS01319 Representation ID: REP03421

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Prafull Patel

Representor No: PRS01319 Representation ID: REP03421

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Praful Patel

Representor No: PRS01319 Representation ID: REP03421

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Ghanshyam Patel

Representor No: PRS01395 Representation ID: REP03519

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Ghanshyam Patel

Representor No: PRS01395 Representation ID: REP03519

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Ghanshyam Patel

Representor No: PRS01395 Representation ID: REP03519

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided..., then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Ghanshyam Patel

Representor No: PRS01395 **Representation ID:** REP03519

Question Ref: H4

2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Ghanshyam Patel

Representor No: PRS01395 Representation ID: REP03519

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Ghanshyam Patel

Representor No: PRS01395 Representation ID: REP03519

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Ghanshyam Patel

Representor No: PRS01395 **Representation ID:** REP03519

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Andrew Paterson

Representor No: PRS01101 **Representation ID:** REP03174

Question Ref: H7

Re: Horsforth SHLAA Reference 1015: Hunger Hills and land south of Lee Lane West

I understand that in drafting the Leeds Core Strategy, the Council identified the above land as unsuitable for housing development in its Site Allocation Plan. We wish to record our agreement with this decision.

The progressive expansion of city living and working over the past centuries has led to erosion of open spaces for relaxation and recreation for city dwellers. This land provides a valuable resource for the locality in an area which is increasingly urbanised. There is a network of public footpaths through an area of open fields currently used for grazing alongside tracts of natural woodland.

Its hill-top location provides an important additional element of natural beauty from afar. The area is an oasis of peace and tranquility where a diversity of wildlife can be appreciated surrounded by the built environment already in existence.

On a practical note, the presence of Japanese knotweed affecting one area of the land is likely to be a disincentive to prospective developers because of its invasive properties being harmful even to built structures, calling into question the structural integrity of such new buildings.

There would need to be substantial upgrading of communication facilities (road network) and social facilities (drains, sewers and utilities) to support any increase in the number of residential homes in this vicinity.

For these reasons we consider it undesirable that the land is developed for housing in the foreseeable future and welcome the decision of the council.

North Comments

Name: Andrew Paterson

Representor No: PRS05736 **Representation ID:** REP06406

Question Ref: H7

ite 1015 Hunger Hills and land south of Lee Lane West
I understand that in drafting the Leeds Core Strategy, the Council identified the above land as unsuitable for housing development in its Site Allocation Plan. We wish to record our agreement with this decision.

The progressive expansion of city living and working over the past centuries has led to erosion of open spaces for relaxation and recreation for city dwellers. This land provides a valuable resource for the locality in an area which is increasingly urbanised. There is a network of public footpaths through an area of open fields currently used for grazing alongside tracts of natural woodland. Its hill-top location provides an important additional element of natural beauty from afar. The area is an oasis of peace and tranquility where a diversity of wildlife can be appreciated surrounded by the built environment already in existence.

On a practical note, the presence of Japanese knotweed affecting one area of the land is likely to be a disincentive to prospective developers because of its invasive properties being harmful even to built structures, calling into question the structural integrity of such new buildings.

There would need to be substantial upgrading of communication facilities (road network) and social facilities (drains, sewers and utilities) to support any increase in the number of residential homes in this vicinity.

For these reasons we consider it undesirable that the land is developed for housing in the foreseeable future and welcome the decision of the council.

North Comments

Name: J Pawsey

Representor No: PRS01969 Representation ID: REP04159

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: J Pawsey

Representor No: PRS01969 Representation ID: REP04164

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: J Pawsey

Representor No: PRS01969 Representation ID: REP04260

Question Ref: H1

1199 - No - See the next question for the main reasons.

Question Ref: H2

1199 - Comments

- A housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic.
- We do not have the infrastructure to cope with the extra traffic.
- Moseley Wood Gardens has a concrete base. A cosmetic layer of tarmac is periodically applied. Extra traffic will have an impact. Streets will require constant attention. Heavy plant used during site construction will create further damage to the concrete base.
- Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times. That situation will worsen substantially with the new development.
- Commuters from Harrogate, Otley and outlying areas use Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route. Additional local traffic from a new estate will add to the problems.
- The development will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. Traffic from a new development will add substantially to the winter chaos. Roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Cookridge in winter months.
- The area will attract less people with the increased difficulties in navigating to and from Cookridge.
- The development will impact on the local schools. School places will become an issue.
- Parking is problematic and dangerous outside of the local school, Tesco and Post Office. Road safety is of prime concern. The problems will worsen with a new development. Residents are severely affected by the current situation.
- The train service is questionable. A minimum number of carriages are provided at peak times. Parking at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate for local people. Commuters travel by car from outside Leeds, park their cars on the streets around the station, and use the local train. Extra housing will compound the problems.
- There is concern over the inadequacy of the current public transport system in the area and there is poor connectivity to a number of locations in the city. As a result of this issue and a number of others this development would neither be environmentally or socially sustainable.
- Flooding may become a problem to the railway line from surface run off, causing delays.
- The countryside adjacent to Cookridge will be destroyed along with the ecology.

Question Ref: H3

3044 / 3360 - These two sites could be used to create a whole new village that would be purpose built to accommodate the increase in the number of residents who would be attracted to the area. It would be an opportunity to build a new school, shops, dental surgery, and an accessible public house within walking distance. Jobs would be created. These two sites are at a higher elevation and therefore the problems of winter would not pose such a big problem to motorists. However, there will still be issues related to public transport, parking in the vicinity of the train station, and the large increase in traffic.

North Comments

Name: Julie Payne

Representor No: PRS05957 Representation ID: REP06729

Question Ref: H1

Potential Development – Cookridge – Site No. 1199

I have grown up in Cookridge, on Woodhill Road and later on Moseley Wood Drive and Woodhill Court. I spent my childhood playing on Moseley Bottom down by the beck. In fact, most children in the area spent their time there, building dens, building dams, catching tadpoles and frogs, fishing and building rope swings from the trees overhanging the beck. We didn't need a playground or to sit in front of the television, we had our playground on the doorstep. We all learnt to make friends and interact with other children, learnt about nature - it cost nothing - nothing to our parents and nothing for the council to upkeep.

Unfortunately that has since changed due to residents at the bottom of Woodhill Road and on Moseley Wood Croft extending their gardens and blocking access to the rest of the Cookridge residents to the back of Woodhill Road, leaving just Moseley Bottom available to access (as long as there are no sheep in the field). In fact, people could walk along the beck from Moseley Wood Croft to the Fox and Hounds for a drink during the summer months.

I'm a dog walker and already have access issues to fields in the area. I walk my dogs twice a day on Moseley Bottom as it's a place I can let my dogs off their leads and exercise them properly, it's the only open space we have available in that part of Cookridge. It's also a busy recreational space where children take advantage of the open space by playing football, golf, picnics and come and look at the wildlife that live in the area.

During winter when the snow comes, children spend their time sledging and generally enjoying the weather the area provides.

Wildlife

The wildlife in the area includes bats (we've even had one that flew into my daughters bedroom), 3 deer, 2 Red Kites that have been nesting in the area for the past 2/3 years, Woodpeckers, Barn Owls, 1 Heron, 2 Moor Hens, Kingfishers during Spring & Summer in the beck and numerous foxes living within the field.

Traffic

As for the extra traffic to the area. Cookridge is already a bottleneck during peak times with traffic queuing on Woodhill Road, Tinshill Road, Tinshill Lane and Haigh Wood Road all trying to cross the bridge. This is compounded by commuters of the airport and train station. Traffic constantly comes to a standstill. I work on New Road Side in Horsforth, a 5 minute drive away normally, but which can take up to 20 minutes on really bad days. Cookridge is also served by only one bus route, the number 6. On an evening during rush hour, it can be packed with commuters and students for which it doesn't empty until the students get off at Headingley. It's the same problem with the train and can be standing room only on occasions, especially when students are resident at Trinity University. Horsforth train station is also used as a park and ride for people living in North Yorkshire. I understand that the fares in North Yorkshire are much higher than West Yorkshire, so you find commuters travelling from Harrogate and parking up on the streets in Cookridge to make the rest of their commute by train.

Schools

Moving onto the subject of schools in the area. Cookridge consists of 2 Primary Schools in the area. Cookridge Primary now covers Tinshill, as Tinshill Primary has only recently closed in the past few years feeding the children into Cookridge Primary. As for Holy Trinity, its only just been extended to cater for numbers, of which back when my kids were young, there were 30 to a class and used portakabins for some of the year groups which were cold during the winter months. Horsforth High School, where my children also went, and is only a 10 minute walk away from my house, has now changed its policy to allowing only children living in Horsforth, leaving Cookridge residents very little choice in High School options.

Not sure what the availability is on Playgroups and Nurseries, I couldn't get a place for a Council run Nursery attached to Ireland Wood School, there weren't enough places so had to make do with one of the two playgroups that Cookridge has to offer, as these were the cheapest option for me at the time, I couldn't afford one of the privately run Nurseries in the area. Does the council plan to open more nursery spaces to take the extra demand for the area?

I'm not sure if my views will be considered, but these are real. I know the council already has a tight budget, the roads in the area are in poor condition. I e-mailed the Highways Dept earlier this year pointing out the condition of where Woodhill Road meets with Green Lane, they came out and slapped some tar in which broke of 2/3 weeks later. I can't keep contacting the Highways, there are so many potholes in the area it would be impossible to pinpoint them all on an e-mail. It would have been better for the Highways to check the condition of the rest of the roads in the area at the same time rather than relying on residents to make contact. I phoned recently about a litter bin for Moseley Wood Croft, I was told there was no budget. They have since delivered one, I assume the council have now managed to find some funding, but if funding for the community is tight, how does it think it can cope with maintenance on another 400 plus residents in the area?

Thank you for taking the time to read my views which I'm sure will speak for a lot of Cookridge residents.

North Comments

Name: Michael Peacock

Representor No: PRS01397 Representation ID: REP03521

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Michael Peacock

Representor No: PRS01397 Representation ID: REP03521

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Michael Peacock

Representor No: PRS01397 Representation ID: REP03521

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Michael Peacock

Representor No: PRS01397 Representation ID: REP03521

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Michael Peacock

Representor No: PRS01397 Representation ID: REP03521

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Michael Peacock

Representor No: PRS01397 **Representation ID:** REP03521

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites

North Comments

Name: Anita Peacock

Representor No: PRS01426 Representation ID: REP03533

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Anita Peacock

Representor No: PRS01426 Representation ID: REP03533

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Anita Peacock

Representor No: PRS01426 Representation ID: REP03533

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Anita Peacock

Representor No: PRS01426 **Representation ID:** REP03533

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Anita Peacock

Representor No: PRS01426 Representation ID: REP03533

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Anita Peacock

Representor No: PRS01426 Representation ID: REP03533

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Anita Peacock

Representor No: PRS01426 **Representation ID:** REP03533

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Richard Pearce

Representor No: PRS04883 Representation ID: REP00727

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H2

1199 - Cookridge is already a sprawling suburb with an unbalanced ratio of housing to structured public green space (EG: parks + allotments), education, transport, health, employment and shopping infrastructures. To attempt to build nearly 200 homes on the Moseley Wood Bottom land, with just the single Moseley Wood Rise access point seems unreasonable. I feel this will further unbalance the area and place even more strain on the local roads and other infrastructures, which seem to be built with barely enough capacity to support the existing requirements. IF this land HAS to be used for housing then I would request a much reduced number of houses, additional access (perhaps via Cookridge Drive or Smithy Lane), some park land (including children's play equipment) and allotments along with increased local school capacity.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

1151 - Too far from local facilities. Would encourage sprawl (no defensible boundary). 2046 - Whilst this would seem like a good site, if it's within the airport's Public Safety Zone then it should not be built on. 2160 - Too far from existing Centre. Would encourage sprawl. 3044 - Would encourage sprawl (no defensible boundary). Potential for run-off water flow damage to local SSSI. 3360 - Would encourage sprawl (no defensible boundary). Potential for run-off water flow damage to local SSSI.

Question Ref: H9

1199 - Existing area already unbalanced; 200 more houses and the increase in traffic will reduce the quality of "liveability" of the existing areas. If this land was desired for housing then the existing estate, roads and other infrastructure should have been designed with suitable capacity from the start. They do not seem to have been designed as such, so such a large number of new houses should not be built.

Question Ref: H12

I believe Cookridge is too far from the main travel arteries (EG motorways) to be suitable for travellers.

Question Ref: H14

3044 - Part of this site, bordered by Pinfold Lane, the golf course, Hall Lane and Cookridge Lane could perhaps be used for single-storey elderly housing. I believe that this would not set too much of a precedent to development on the east side of Cookridge Lane.

North Comments

Name: Jerry Pearlman

Representor No: PRS06121 **Representation ID:** REP06994

Question Ref: H1

118 - This site has been the subject of refusal of an application for planning permission which was upheld on appeal and thus should not be included.

North Comments

Name: Jerry Pearlman

Representor No: PRS06121 **Representation ID:** REP06994

Question Ref: H4

2053B
CONCLUSION - In the context of all the above we submit that as this whole 2051 site [both parts A and B] is within the Green Belt and is also a Special Landscape Area. It is a site which adds much to the distinctive character of the Parish, the Area and the City. It also contributes to the manner in which visitors to the City first see the City when coming from the Northern adjacent areas which is the first that some see of the attributes of the City. It is a site which should not, indeed must not be allocated for any development. We urge that it should not be included in the Allocation.

The Council has given considerable thought to the draft in so far as it affects the Parish and we set out below our views which we hope that you will accept. In doing so, we are mindful that the SHLAA index notes that sites 2053 and 2051 would only be developed as a "last resort" when other brownfield and greenfield sites have been used up. The document states that these sites are a long term prospect subject to re-drawing of Green Belt boundary. Dependent on future build rates and the exhaustion of other sequentially preferable brownfield land and greenfield sites already identified. The Parish Council supports this statement and would certainly oppose any development on either of these sites before all alternative brownfield (and preferable greenfield sites) have been used up. We express concern that any allocation in protected areas will be a first step towards the redrawing of the Green belt boundary, which we strongly oppose.

Like Site 2051, site 2053 is bordered by a footpath and a golf course, both of which enable residents of the city to engage in outdoor recreation in open unspoilt countryside. Development here would remove this opportunity. It would, for example overlook, the well-used footpath on the southern side of the reservoir as well as one of the two popular footpaths which connect Goodrick Lodge and the eastern end of Alwoodley Lane. It would also seriously encroach upon Eccup Reservoir [see below for discussion of this SSSI]. We also consider that additional housing on this site will generate additional traffic on the A61 which will make the highway network virtually unsustainable. The junction at Alwoodley Gates is already heavily burdened with traffic, particularly at rush hour, and development here would undermine the recent highway improvement work. However we acknowledge that this site already has access to the main transport network and is also adjacent to another site which we have reason to believe is not challenged by the adjoining parish in whose areas it lies

Site No. 2051 has caused us the greatest concern. The Council is concerned to emphasise that our objections cannot merely be dismissed as "NIMBY" (not in my backyard) because development here would have adverse effects for the city as a whole. This countryside is enjoyed by residents from across the whole city (and beyond) and indeed people from all over Leeds are proud of the fact that the city possesses unspoilt countryside of this standard on its doorstep. We would remind you of the way in which planners saw the city as a whole in the Draft Core Strategy: para 2.37: 'Two-thirds of the Leeds district is Green Belt and it is also in reach of two national parks. The green local environment is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment also makes people proud of the district, and is important for improved physical and mental health as it provides a sense of well-being and opportunities for leisure. The environment also gives Leeds its distinctive character and identity, and attracts businesses, investment and visitors, and provides a resource for education and industry.

Para 2.38 'One of the city's distinguishing features is the way in which green corridors stretch from the surrounding countryside into the heart of the main urban areas.'

Para 2.41 'The district's distinctive landscape corridor needs to be respected, conserved and enriches.'

Para 32. 'The distinctive settlement pattern within the Leeds district will be maintained and their character enhanced. Whilst providing for and supporting new housing growth opportunities. The main urban area of Leeds will support the diverse and distinctive communities that surround it, separated by agricultural land, woodland, valuable green spaces, habitats and amenity areas.' 'Leeds will have a wide network of multi-functional Green Infrastructure [including green spaces areas] which provides an improved quality of life for residents to enjoy healthier lifestyles. This will also be a strong incentive in attracting new business to the area. Through new development, opportunities will be taken to improve connections between Green Infrastructure to enhance its value and achieve a better special distribution'

Para 4.1.14 'The delivery of the strategy will entail the use of Brownfield and Greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green [belt land, where this offers the most sustainable option.'

Para 4.8.3 'In helping to protect this overall character and the identity the Leeds Green Belt plays a key role in keeping land open and free from development and in making a clear distinction between town and country. National Planning Policy describes the purposes of and prescribes the use of land in the Green belt including the definition of inappropriate development. The Leeds Green Belt has been established in accordance with this guidance.

Para 3.8.4 'The guidance requires that once established, the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances. The Green Belt boundary in Leeds has been established in Local Plans and the UDP. Changes were made in 2001 in order to meet the need for housing and employment land and make provision for possible long term growth beyond the plan period.'

Para 4.8.6 In summary, the City Council has recognised that this site contains countryside of the highest quality and forms part of a belt of countryside of which residents of Leeds can be duly proud.

Protected Areas of Search

The Leeds Unitary Development Plan designated land out side of the Green Belt for unidentified needs in the future; this is known as Protected Areas of Search (PAS). This land will provide one of the prime sources for housing allocations in the LDF. Which land is identified by LDF Allocation Documents (and in particular the Site Allocations DPD) will depend on how well it meets the strategy of housing distribution, embodies by the criteria in Spatial Policy 6. Land not appropriate for housing might be needed for employment allocations or retained as future PAS in the LDF.

Spatial Policy 6 lists certain relevant criteria, including:

- 1) Sustainable locations (which meets standards of public transport accessibility...). Supported by existing or access to new local facilities and services;
- 2) Preference for Brownfield and regeneration sites;
- 3) The least impact on Green Belt purposes;
- 6) The least negative and most positive impacts on green Infrastructure, green corridors, green space, and nature conservation.

Neither site 2051 nor 2053 was identified as a Protected Area of Search site. This is unsurprising since neither site it fits the criteria of Spatial Policy 6: the sites are in the Green Belt, they do not have infrastructure which will support development and they are of immense benefit to all the inhabitants of Leeds with their well-used footpath networks, trees and excellent views. Both sites constitute prime resources for recreation and relaxation as well as mental and physical enjoyment. Since the sites were not designated as Protected Area of Search sites as recently as 2006 when the Unitary Development Plan was reviewed, this Council sees no reason why they should be allocated for housing development now.

Local and National Designations

North Comments

Name: Jerry Pearlman

Representor No: PRS06121 **Representation ID:** REP06994

Both sites have received a number of local and national designations from the City Council and central government agencies. This demonstrates their importance to the city as a whole and to the nation. Indeed, these designations means that all or part of both sites are considered 'protected areas.' (UDP, Vol, 2, p.67)

Special Landscape Area (SLA) Both sites 2051 and 2053 lie in Special Landscape area 6 'Golden Acre/Eccup' which is described in the following glowing terms in the UDP:

Well-kept agricultural land dotted with farmsteads, small woodlands and shelterbelts. Several golf courses lie along the southern fringes but have a wooded moorland character which fits well into the locality. The wooded parkland of Golden Acre Park, Fish Pond Plantation and the Adel Dam nature reserve are complemented by attractive water bodies. The attractive Eccup Beck valley is dominated by the broad expanse of Eccup Reservoir. Positive factors: strong structure and visual unity, high scenic quality, attractive groups of buildings, landmarks, natural or semi-natural woods, trees, hedgerows, water bodies. Negative factors: none.
(UDP Vol. 2, Appendices, p.236)

The UDP clearly recognised that this is countryside of the highest quality, with no negative features. To develop either site, therefore, would be a serious mistake. The manner in which the UDP see the importance of SLAs is shown by the description in the Written Statement:

5.5.7 The countryside around Leeds shows a great diversity of landscape character, ranging from areas where that character is strong and attractive to areas where the character has been seriously depleted. Development proposals in the areas of best quality landscape must show particular regard to conservation of the landscape, but throughout the countryside as a whole the effect on landscape character will be a material consideration in determining planning applications.

5.5.8 Countryside with high landscape value needs to be protected from visually harmful development and be maintained and improved where necessary in order to safeguard its attractive character and appearance. The most attractive areas have been designated Special Landscape Areas. Those areas have been judged to possess several of the following positive characteristics and few or none of the negative:
Positive factors: strong structure and visual unity [arising, for example, from hedges or walls marking field boundaries], interesting topography, high scenic quality, local rarity, attractive groups of buildings, landmarks, natural or semi-natural woods, trees, hedgerows, water bodies. Negative factors: untidy or derelict land, large and visually intrusive industrial buildings, other eyesores. A brief description of the special qualities of each of the SLAs is included in Appendix 26 of the Plan.

N37: IN THE DESIGNATED SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS, DEVELOPMENT WILL BE ACCEPTABLE PROVIDED IT WOULD NOT SERIOUSLY HARM THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE LANDSCAPE. THE SITING, DESIGN AND MATERIALS OF ANY DEVELOPMENT MUST BE SYMPATHETIC TO ITS SETTING AND, WHERE NECESSARY, LANDSCAPING OF THE SITE WILL BE REQUIRED.
(UDP, Vol. 1, pp.87-8)

Clearly, then, these SLA would be an inappropriate area for two large housing developments, which would undoubtedly transform the character and appearance of these unspoilt, open, well-preserved landscapes. The immense importance of this land to the city as a whole is further demonstrated by the fact that it has other exceptionally important designations such as:

Leeds Nature Areas (LNAs) The UDP also reveals that site 2051 abuts Eccup Whin which is a Leeds Nature Area Area (LNA 36). In addition site 2053, incorporates the southern portion of LNA48 (Harewood Estate Woodlands) which would also enable us to challenge development on this site.

Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Eccup Reservoir has been designated by Natural England as a nationally important SSSI. This means that development on its borders would be highly inappropriate. Development at Site 2053, for example, would encroach upon the reservoir's southern reaches.

Natural England's SSSI citation for Eccup Reservoir (designated 1987) explains that the reservoir supports the rare bladder sedge and winter habitats for goosander (approx. 1-2% of the UK population of this bird). Natural England's designation stresses the national importance of this site: Eccup Reservoir is on the trans-Pennine bird migration route and its size and location make it a very attractive site for wintering birds and passage migrants. Its recognised national significance for goosander makes it the most important open water area for wildfowl in West Yorkshire. (Natural England citation document for Eccup Reservoir)

The planning guidance for and SSSIs and LNAs in the UDP is: Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) are of national or international importance for nature conservation and these comprise the most precious habitats in the District. The interests of nature conservation will prevail over all but the most exceptional needs for development of such sites. Leeds Nature Areas (LNAs) are sites of local or District – wide importance for the enjoyment, study or conservation of wildlife, geological features and landforms. They are of particular value in parts of the city where residents would otherwise have little opportunity to enjoy and learn about wildlife close to their homes. The location of these sites [SSSI, LNA, etc.] is shown on the Proposals Map and they are listed in Appendix 8 of Volume 2. The following planning policies aim to protect these sites from development which would significantly reduce their interest for nature conservation. Such harm can be direct or indirect and can arise from air, noise and water pollution and from drainage as well as from physical works to the site or nearby land. In some cases it will be possible to reduce the impact of development acceptably through the imposition of appropriate conditions and, rarely, the public benefit of development may outweigh the nature conservation value of the site. Occasionally it may be possible to replace a LNA with a site of equivalent interest, provided it is equally accessible to local residents. In general the

more important a site is for nature conservation or the greater the likely impact of development, the less likely it will be to be acceptable.
N50: DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT BE PERMITTED WHICH WOULD SERIOUSLY HARM, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, THROUGH ANY MEANS, A SSSI, LNR, SEGI OR LNR. IN CONSIDERING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR ANY OF THE ABOVE NATURE SITES, THE NEEDS OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF NATURE ENVIRONMENT LEEDS UDP REVIEW – VOLUME 1: WRITTEN STATEMENT – ADOPTED JULY 2006 103

CONSERVATION WILL BE EXAMINED. IN PARTICULAR ACCOUNT WILL BE TAKEN OF: i. THE EXTENT AND SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL DAMAGE TO THE NATURE CONSERVATION INTEREST; ii. THE EXTENT TO WHICH THAT DAMAGE COULD BE REDUCED BY IMPOSING CONDITIONS ON A PLANNING PERMISSION; iii. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT TO THE LOCAL, REGIONAL OR NATIONAL INTEREST; iv. IN THE CASE OF A LAN, WHETHER A REPLACEMENT SITE OF EQUIVALENT NATURE CONSERVATION INTEREST CAN BE PROVIDED WITHIN THE SAME LOCALITY.
(UDP Vol. 1, pp.102-3)

Site of Ecological or Geological Interest The southern portion of area "B" in site 2051 lies in a Site of Ecological or Geological Importance (SEGI),

North Comments

Name: Jerry Pearlman

Representor No: PRS06121 **Representation ID:** REP06994

specifically SEGI 19 (Meanwood Valley) of which it forms the most northerly portion. The planning guidance for SEGIs is covered under N50 (see the quote above under SSSI/LNA). SEGIs are defined as: SEGI - Sites of Ecological or Geological Importance site designated as being of county-wide importance for its flora, fauna, geology or landforms, as recommended by West Yorkshire Ecology or the West Yorkshire RIGS (Regionally Important Geological Sites) Group. Within the District, SEGIs are designated by Leeds City Council. This is a non-statutory Designation. (UDP, Vol. 2, p.67).

Roads

This Council is of the opinion that development at site 2051 would have a massively adverse impact on the local road network by overloading King Lane between the Ring Road and Arthington Road; it would also place major strain on the junctions of King Lane and Alwoodley Lane and the Avenue. This would necessitate extremely costly highway improvements which would be unacceptable on the rural parts of King Lane and impossible on the already built up parts of Alwoodley further south. Again, this would not merely have an impact on residents of Alwoodley, but on all users of the road network in this area. The provision of public transport in this area would also be ill-suited to cope with the increase in demand.

Recreation: Footpaths and Cycle Routes

Site 2051 is well used, appreciated and needed by the whole City and perhaps the Region. It has important leisure facilities such as:

- The Meanwood Valley Trail and the Leeds County way skirt the western edges of site 2051 and development here would seriously compromise the rural feel on these sections of the routes. It would rather detract from the title "Country Way." For the Meanwood Valley Trail this is particularly significant as the walker expects to reach true open countryside at this point, having emerged from the northern end of Adel woods.
- The Dales Way link passes through the centre of site 2051: this is a long distance regional route which links Leeds to Ilkley and before crossing the Yorkshire Dales to Windermere.
- As well as these regionally important routes, site 2051 is criss-crossed by several local footpaths which link Alwoodley to Eccup and connect the northern end of Adel Woods to Eccup and Alwoodley.
- The West Yorkshire Cycle Route passes along the northern boundary of site 2053. Like the Leeds Country Way, this is intended to be a rural route around West Yorkshire's Rural perimeter.
- Site 2053 is bounded by two well-used footpaths: one runs round the southern rim of Eccup Reservoir; the second connects the reservoir path to Alwoodley Lane, crossing Sandmoor Golf Course.

North Comments

Name: Jerry Pearlman

Representor No: PRS06121 Representation ID: REP06994

Question Ref: H7

2053A
2051A and 2051B
CONCLUSION - In the context of all the above we submit that as this whole 2051 site [both parts A and B] is within the Green Belt and is also a Special Landscape Area. It is a site which adds much to the distinctive character of the Parish, the Area and the City. It also contributes to the manner in which visitors to the City first see the City when coming from the Northern adjacent areas which is the first that some see of the attributes of the City. It is a site which should not, indeed must not be allocated for any development. We urge that it should not be included in the Allocation.

The Council has given considerable thought to the draft in so far as it affects the Parish and we set out below our views which we hope that you will accept. In doing so, we are mindful that the SHLAA index notes that sites 2053 and 2051 would only be developed as a "last resort" when other brownfield and greenfield sites have been used up. The document states that these sites are a long term prospect subject to re-drawing of Green Belt boundary. Dependent on future build rates and the exhaustion of other sequentially preferable brownfield land and greenfield sites already identified. The Parish Council supports this statement and would certainly oppose any development on either of these sites before all alternative brownfield (and preferable greenfield sites) have been used up. We express concern that any allocation in protected areas will be a first step towards the redrawing of the Green belt boundary, which we strongly oppose.

Like Site 2051, site 2053 is bordered by a footpath and a golf course, both of which enable residents of the city to engage in outdoor recreation in open unspoilt countryside. Development here would remove this opportunity. It would, for example overlook, the well-used footpath on the southern side of the reservoir as well as one of the two popular footpaths which connect Goodrick Lodge and the eastern end of Alwoodley Lane. It would also seriously encroach upon Eccup Reservoir [see below for discussion of this SSSI]. We also consider that additional housing on this site will generate additional traffic on the A61 which will make the highway network virtually unsustainable. The junction at Alwoodley Gates is already heavily burdened with traffic, particularly at rush hour, and development here would undermine the recent highway improvement work. However we acknowledge that this site already has access to the main transport network and is also adjacent to another site which we have reason to believe is not challenged by the adjoining parish in whose areas it lies

Site No. 2051 has caused us the greatest concern. The Council is concerned to emphasise that our objections cannot merely be dismissed as "NIMBY" (not in my backyard) because development here would have adverse effects for the city as a whole. This countryside is enjoyed by residents from across the whole city (and beyond) and indeed people from all over Leeds are proud of the fact that the city possesses unspoilt countryside of this standard on its doorstep. We would remind you of the way in which planners saw the city as a whole in the Draft Core Strategy: para 2.37: 'Two-thirds of the Leeds district is Green Belt and it is also in reach of two national parks. The green local environment is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment also makes people proud of the district, and is important for improved physical and mental health as it provides a sense of well-being and opportunities for leisure. The environment also gives Leeds its distinctive character and identity, and attracts businesses, investment and visitors, and provides a resource for education and industry.

Para 2.38 'One of the city's distinguishing features is the way in which green corridors stretch from the surrounding countryside into the heart of the main urban areas.'

Para 2.41 'The district's distinctive landscape corridor needs to be respected, conserved and enriches.'

Para 32. 'The distinctive settlement pattern within the Leeds district will be maintained and their character enhanced. Whilst providing for and supporting new housing growth opportunities. The main urban area of Leeds will support the diverse and distinctive communities that surround it, separated by agricultural land, woodland, valuable green spaces, habitats and amenity areas.' 'Leeds will have a wide network of multi-functional Green Infrastructure [including green spaces areas] which provides an improved quality of life for residents to enjoy healthier lifestyles. This will also be a strong incentive in attracting new business to the area. Through new development, opportunities will be taken to improve connections between Green Infrastructure to enhance its value and achieve a better special distribution'

Para 4.1.14 'The delivery of the strategy will entail the use of Brownfield and Greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green [belt land, where this offers the most sustainable option.'

Para 4.8.3 'In helping to protect this overall character and the identity the Leeds Green Belt plays a key role in keeping land open and free from development and in making a clear distinction between town and country. National Planning Policy describes the purposes of and prescribes the use of land in the Green belt including the definition of inappropriate development. The Leeds Green Belt has been established in accordance with this guidance.

Para 3.8.4 'The guidance requires that once established, the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances. The Green Belt boundary in Leeds has been established in Local Plans and the UDP. Changes were made in 2001 in order to meet the need for housing and employment land and make provision for possible long term growth beyond the plan period.'

Para 4.8.6 In summary, the City Council has recognised that this site contains countryside of the highest quality and forms part of a belt of countryside of which residents of Leeds can be duly proud.

Protected Areas of Search

The Leeds Unitary Development Plan designated land out side of the Green Belt for unidentified needs in the future; this is known as Protected Areas of Search (PAS). This land will provide one of the prime sources for housing allocations in the LDF. Which land is identified by LDF Allocation Documents (and in particular the Site Allocations DPD) will depend on how well it meets the strategy of housing distribution, embodies by the criteria in Spatial Policy 6. Land not appropriate for housing might be needed for employment allocations or retained as future PAS in the LDF.

Spatial Policy 6 lists certain relevant criteria, including:

- 1) Sustainable locations (which meets standards of public transport accessibility...). Supported by existing or access to new local facilities and services;
- 2) Preference for Brownfield and regeneration sites;
- 3) The least impact on Green Belt purposes;
- 6) The least negative and most positive impacts on green Infrastructure, green corridors, green space, and nature conservation.

Neither site 2051 nor 2053 was identified as a Protected Area of Search site. This is unsurprising since neither site it fits the criteria of Spatial Policy 6: the sites are in the Green Belt, they do not have infrastructure which will support development and they are of immense benefit to all the inhabitants of Leeds with their well-used footpath networks, trees and excellent views. Both sites constitute prime resources for recreation and relaxation as well as mental and physical enjoyment. Since the sites were not designated as Protected Area of Search sites as recently as 2006 when the Unitary Development Plan was reviewed, this Council sees no reason why they should be allocated for housing development now.

North Comments

Name: Jerry Pearlman

Representor No: PRS06121 **Representation ID:** REP06994

Local and National Designations

Both sites have received a number of local and national designations from the City Council and central government agencies. This demonstrates their importance to the city as a whole and to the nation. Indeed, these designations means that all or part of both sites are considered 'protected areas.' (UDP, Vol. 2, p.67)

Special Landscape Area (SLA) Both sites 2051 and 2053 lie in Special Landscape area 6 'Golden Acre/Eccup' which is described in the following glowing terms in the UDP:

Well-kept agricultural land dotted with farmsteads, small woodlands and shelterbelts. Several golf courses lie along the southern fringes but have a wooded moorland character which fits well into the locality. The wooded parkland of Golden Acre Park, Fish Pond Plantation and the Adel Dam nature reserve are complemented by attractive water bodies. The attractive Eccup Beck valley is dominated by the broad expanse of Eccup Reservoir. Positive factors: strong structure and visual unity, high scenic quality, attractive groups of buildings, landmarks, natural or semi-natural woods, trees, hedgerows, water bodies. Negative factors: none.
(UDP Vol. 2, Appendices, p.236)

The UDP clearly recognised that this is countryside of the highest quality, with no negative features. To develop either site, therefore, would be a serious mistake. The manner in which the UDP see the importance of SLAs is shown by the description in the Written Statement:

5.5.7 The countryside around Leeds shows a great diversity of landscape character, ranging from areas where that character is strong and attractive to areas where the character has been seriously depleted. Development proposals in the areas of best quality landscape must show particular regard to conservation of the landscape, but throughout the countryside as a whole the effect on landscape character will be a material consideration in determining planning applications.

5.5.8 Countryside with high landscape value needs to be protected from visually harmful development and be maintained and improved where necessary in order to safeguard its attractive character and appearance. The most attractive areas have been designated Special Landscape Areas. Those areas have been judged to possess several of the following positive characteristics and few or none of the negative:
Positive factors: strong structure and visual unity [arising, for example, from hedges or walls marking field boundaries], interesting topography, high scenic quality, local rarity, attractive groups of buildings, landmarks, natural or semi-natural woods, trees, hedgerows, water bodies.
Negative factors: untidy or derelict land, large and visually intrusive industrial buildings, other eyesores. A brief description of the special qualities of each of the SLAs is included in Appendix 26 of the Plan.

N37: IN THE DESIGNATED SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS, DEVELOPMENT WILL BE ACCEPTABLE PROVIDED IT WOULD NOT SERIOUSLY HARM THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE LANDSCAPE. THE SITING, DESIGN AND MATERIALS OF ANY DEVELOPMENT MUST BE SYMPATHETIC TO ITS SETTING AND, WHERE NECESSARY, LANDSCAPING OF THE SITE WILL BE REQUIRED.
(UDP, Vol. 1, pp.87-8)

Clearly, then, these SLA would be an inappropriate area for two large housing developments, which would undoubtedly transform the character and appearance of these unspoilt, open, well-preserved landscapes. The immense importance of this land to the city as a whole is further demonstrated by the fact that it has other exceptionally important designations such as:

Leeds Nature Areas (LNAs) The UDP also reveals that site 2051 abuts Eccup Whin which is a Leeds Nature Area Area (LNA 36). In addition site 2053, incorporates the southern portion of LNA48 (Harewood Estate Woodlands) which would also enable us to challenge development on this site.

Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Eccup Reservoir has been designated by Natural England as a nationally important SSSI. This means that development on its borders would be highly inappropriate. Development at Site 2053, for example, would encroach upon the reservoir's southern reaches.

Natural England's SSSI citation for Eccup Reservoir (designated 1987) explains that the reservoir supports the rare bladder sedge and winter habitats for goosander (approx. 1-2% of the UK population of this bird). Natural England's designation stresses the national importance of this site: Eccup Reservoir is on the trans-Pennine bird migration route and its size and location make it a very attractive site for wintering birds and passage migrants. Its recognised national significance for goosander makes it the most important open water area for wildfowl in West Yorkshire. (Natural England citation document for Eccup Reservoir)

The planning guidance for and SSSIs and LNAs in the UDP is: Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) are of national or international importance for nature conservation and these comprise the most precious habitats in the District. The interests of nature conservation will prevail over all but the most exceptional needs for development of such sites. Leeds Nature Areas (LNAs) are sites of local or District – wide importance for the enjoyment, study or conservation of wildlife, geological features and landforms. They are of particular value in parts of the city where residents would otherwise have little opportunity to enjoy and learn about wildlife close to their homes. The location of these sites [SSSI, LNA, etc.] is shown on the Proposals Map and they are listed in Appendix 8 of Volume 2. The following planning policies aim to protect these sites from development which would significantly reduce their interest for nature conservation. Such harm can be direct or indirect and can arise from air, noise and water pollution and from drainage as well as from physical works to the site or nearby land. In some cases it will be possible to reduce the impact of development acceptably through the imposition of appropriate conditions and, rarely, the public benefit of development may outweigh the nature conservation value of the site. Occasionally it may be possible to replace a LNA with a site of equivalent interest, provided it is equally accessible to local residents. In general the more important a site is for nature conservation or the greater the likely impact of development, the less likely it will be to be acceptable.
N50: DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT BE PERMITTED WHICH WOULD SERIOUSLY HARM, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, THROUGH ANY MEANS, A SSSI, LNR, SEGI OR LNR. IN CONSIDERING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR ANY OF THE ABOVE NATURE SITES, THE NEEDS OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF NATURE ENVIRONMENT LEEDS UDP REVIEW – VOLUME 1: WRITTEN STATEMENT – ADOPTED JULY 2006 103

CONSERVATION WILL BE EXAMINED. IN PARTICULAR ACCOUNT WILL BE TAKEN OF: i. THE EXTENT AND SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL DAMAGE TO THE NATURE CONSERVATION INTEREST; ii. THE EXTENT TO WHICH THAT DAMAGE COULD BE REDUCED BY IMPOSING CONDITIONS ON A PLANNING PERMISSION; iii. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT TO THE LOCAL, REGIONAL OR NATIONAL INTEREST; iv. IN THE CASE OF A LAN, WHETHER A REPLACEMENT SITE OF EQUIVALENT NATURE CONSERVATION INTEREST CAN BE PROVIDED WITHIN THE SAME LOCALITY.
(UDP Vol. 1, pp.102-3)

North Comments

Name: Jerry Pearlman

Representor No: PRS06121 **Representation ID:** REP06994

Site of Ecological or Geological Interest The southern portion of area "B" in site 2051 lies in a Site of Ecological or Geological Importance (SEGI), specifically SEGI 19 (Meanwood Valley) of which it forms the most northerly portion. The planning guidance for SEGIs is covered under N50 (see the quote above under SSSI/LNA). SEGIs are defined as: SEGI - Sites of Ecological or Geological Importance site designated as being of county-wide importance for its flora, fauna, geology or landforms, as recommended by West Yorkshire Ecology or the West Yorkshire RIGS (Regionally Important Geological Sites) Group. Within the District, SEGIs are designated by Leeds City Council. This is a non-statutory Designation. (UDP, Vol. 2, p.67).

Roads

This Council is of the opinion that development at site 2051 would have a massively adverse impact on the local road network by overloading King Lane between the Ring Road and Arthington Road; it would also place major strain on the junctions of King Lane and Alwoodley Lane and the Avenue. This would necessitate extremely costly highway improvements which would be unacceptable on the rural parts of King Lane and impossible on the already built up parts of Alwoodley further south. Again, this would not merely have an impact on residents of Alwoodley, but on all users of the road network in this area. The provision of public transport in this area would also be ill-suited to cope with the increase in demand.

Recreation: Footpaths and Cycle Routes

Site 2051 is well used, appreciated and needed by the whole City and perhaps the Region. It has important leisure facilities such as:

- The Meanwood Valley Trail and the Leeds County way skirt the western edges of site 2051 and development here would seriously compromise the rural feel on these sections of the routes. It would rather detract from the title "Country Way." For the Meanwood Valley Trail this is particularly significant as the walker expects to reach true open countryside at this point, having emerged from the northern end of Adel woods.
- The Dales Way link passes through the centre of site 2051: this is a long distance regional route which links Leeds to Ilkley and before crossing the Yorkshire Dales to Windermere.
- As well as these regionally important routes, site 2051 is criss-crossed by several local footpaths which link Alwoodley to Eccup and connect the northern end of Adel Woods to Eccup and Alwoodley.
- The West Yorkshire Cycle Route passes along the northern boundary of site 2053. Like the Leeds Country Way, this is intended to be a rural route around West Yorkshire's Rural perimeter.
- Site 2053 is bounded by two well-used footpaths: one runs round the southern rim of Eccup Reservoir; the second connects the reservoir path to Alwoodley Lane, crossing Sandmoor Golf Course.

2051B

This is at the point where the existing urban area meets the sylvan and rural area. It is of particular landscape value because it is wooded and meets the eye of those who live in or pass through when looking or travelling out of the city. Adel woods are on the hillside and provide an impressive transition which would be lost if the site was developed. Many from outside the areas use King Lane to access to the Park and Ride to the South.

Question Ref: General comment

This Council made a major submission concerning the various sites which appeared in the earlier stage of the process and notes that many of our comments appear to have been recognised and noted by you. Our comments on the present document, in so far as it affects the parish, are the same as they were at the earlier stage. We do not know if our original submission will be carried forward as comments at this stage and whilst we do appreciate that many of our comments were directed at sites that are no longer proposed to be allocated. nevertheless we feel that we should repeat our earlier comments at this stage and therefore we attach them to this email.

The Council has given considerable thought to the draft in so far as it affects the Parish and we set out below our views which we hope that you will accept. In doing so, we are mindful that the SHLAA index notes that sites 2053 and 2051 would only be developed as a "last resort" when other brownfield and greenfield sites have been used up. The document states that these sites are a long term prospect subject to re-drawing of Green Belt boundary. Dependent on future build rates and the exhaustion of other sequentially preferable brownfield land and greenfield sites already identified. The Parish Council supports this statement and would certainly oppose any development on either of these sites before all alternative brownfield (and preferable greenfield sites) have been used up. We express concern that any allocation in protected areas will be a first step towards the redrawing of the Green belt boundary, which we strongly oppose.

We are also concerned that developers are not given the opportunity to jump the gun and claim that the principle of development is already conceded on these sites as a result of the SHLAA process. The Parish Council notes with concern that developers frustrated the spirit of the City Council's planning policy at Grimes Dyke in East Leeds by applying for outline permission to develop a greenfield site (which the City Council had designated as a protected area of search) before all alternative brownfield sites in the city had been used up. Here, the protected area of search policy failed to prevent development as the developer was able to win their appeal against the refusal of planning permission in 2011. We would not like something similar occur in Alwoodley as a result of the SHLAA.

North Comments

Name: Jackie Peck

Representor No: PRS03310 Representation ID: REP01237

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

No, some of the sites will have a detrimental impact on current residents. More attention should be paid to existing brownfield sites in the centre of Leeds, that are currently derelict.

Question Ref: H2

Plot 118 - Primarily, this is a plot for one house. Previous plans have requested permission for multiple houses on this site, which is not in keeping with other properties in Alwoodley. The roads in this area are narrow and already pose a problem for parking both for residents and visitors. Developing this plot will be detrimental to the mature native trees in the area. There will be no objection to one residence, in keeping with the character of the area.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Red sites around Alwoodley are prime recreational areas, and should be maintained as leisure facilities for walking, cycling and contain wildlife such as nesting herons and red kite.

Question Ref: H11

Developing brownfield sites should be a priority. Many of these are eyesores, and detrimental to the vibrancy of the city.

North Comments

Name: Graham Stewart Pennells

Representor No: PRS03071 Representation ID: REP00849

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Indequate roads in Horsforth & Cookridge to cope with the extra housing. The Moseleys would become a rat run for motorists exiting the development. Access to the Moseley Bottom development site will be a problem and potentially dangerous as the access roads are not wide enough for contractors's vehicles. Potential flooding & drainage problems. Inadequate public transport. Visual impact of over-development of what is now a natural habitat. Impact on local primary & secondary schools

Question Ref: H2

1199 Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

1151 Cookridge Lane a green belt site adjoining the main urban area. 3044 Cookridge Hall Golf Club 3360 Cookridge Hall Both green belt sites

Question Ref: H9

1199 Land off Moseley Wood Gardens. For reasons already given in H1/H2

North Comments

Name: Alan Percy

Representor No: PRS03581 **Representation ID:** REP01771

Question Ref: G1

Sites 1369 and 1095B should be included in the provision of Greenspace to protect the views of the Chevin and be of continuing amenity to the village of Pool in Wharfedale.

Question Ref: G2

n

Question Ref: G2

Greenspace is never in surplus the population of the country is constantly increasing, Greenspace need to increase at the same rate.

Question Ref: G3

n

Question Ref: G4

y

Question Ref: G4

It makes sense to improve Greenspaces were necessary.

Question Ref: G5

n

Question Ref: G5

Just because some Greenspace land is of poor quality it does not mean it is surplus. Greenspace can be improved as it becomes more important to a community.

Question Ref: G6

y

Question Ref: G6

To improve local peoples quality of life.

Question Ref: CCG1

n

Question Ref: CCG2

n

Question Ref: G9

0

Question Ref: G10

0

Question Ref: G8

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G9

Retained for greenspace

North Comments

Name: Gordon & Maggie Perkin

Representor No: PRS01608 Representation ID: REP03760

Question Ref: H1

1299A, 1033 - . We are writing to strongly object to all proposals to build on green belt sites in the Adel area. Several large house-building projects are currently underway in Adel (Bodington Hall, Government Buildings, Centurion Fields) for which there is, in our opinion, inadequate infrastructure, and it is surely environmentally unsustainable to allow properties to be built in the green belt when there are many undeveloped brown field sites in Leeds, and also many empty properties which could be used for housing. It is also of deep concern to us that the natural surroundings and heritage enjoyed by the residents of Adel and its many visitors described in the Adel Design Statement should be maintained.

2. With regard to the developments at Bodington Hall, Government Buildings and Centurion Fields, and any other proposals to build more housing in Adel, our concerns are that:

a) There will be no primary school places at the two Adel schools for children moving into the area. We feel that this will have an adverse impact: (a) it will affect the children's sense of community, since they will have to travel outside the area to school, (b) their independence and ability to walk or cycle to school will be hampered (the school may be too far away; there may be main roads to cross), (c) the children may have to go to school by bus or be driven by parents, adding further congestion of our roads.

b) The main roads surrounding Adel and the narrow road networks and lanes within Adel are already some of the busiest and fastest in the city, all of them used by cars, cyclists, vans and heavy goods vehicles creating a stressful environment for all road users, and most especially for pedestrians. These factors are of great concern to existing local residents, and we would like to feel that LCC transport planners will assure us that suitable measures will be implemented to manage the increased volume and speed of traffic. We do not however feel confident that this will be the case.

c) An increase of numbers in the community will have an impact on local shops, which could be beneficial to the economy, but the extra business will be accompanied by further parking and traffic problems, which are already at times overwhelming along the A660 in Adel, leading to significant road safety concerns.

d) GP facilities in Adel are said to be inadequate to cope with the current number of patients, and could not provide an adequate service for an influx of new patients.

e) There is concern that the older members of the community will be unable to stay in the area because of a lack of public transport services to local facilities and the fact that there appear to be no requirement on developers to build properties of a suitable size for those living in the larger properties in the area to downsize to.

f) There is no central local outdoor play-space for young people in Adel, and sadly, spaces do not seem to have been incorporated in the design plans for Bodington, Government Buildings nor Centurion Fields.

We would like your assurance that all these issues will be addressed and look forward to hearing further from you..

Question Ref: General comment

Lime green site 684/2600220 - . We are writing to strongly object to all proposals to build on green belt sites in the Adel area. Several large house-building projects are currently underway in Adel (Bodington Hall, Government Buildings, Centurion Fields) for which there is, in our opinion, inadequate infrastructure, and it is surely environmentally unsustainable to allow properties to be built in the green belt when there are many undeveloped brown field sites in Leeds, and also many empty properties which could be used for housing. It is also of deep concern to us that the natural surroundings and heritage enjoyed by the residents of Adel and its many visitors described in the Adel Design Statement should be maintained.

2. With regard to the developments at Bodington Hall, Government Buildings and Centurion Fields, and any other proposals to build more housing in Adel, our concerns are that:

a) There will be no primary school places at the two Adel schools for children moving into the area. We feel that this will have an adverse impact: (a) it will affect the children's sense of community, since they will have to travel outside the area to school, (b) their independence and ability to walk or cycle to school will be hampered (the school may be too far away; there may be main roads to cross), (c) the children may have to go to school by bus or be driven by parents, adding further congestion of our roads.

b) The main roads surrounding Adel and the narrow road networks and lanes within Adel are already some of the busiest and fastest in the city, all of them used by cars, cyclists, vans and heavy goods vehicles creating a stressful environment for all road users, and most especially for pedestrians. These factors are of great concern to existing local residents, and we would like to feel that LCC transport planners will assure us that suitable measures will be implemented to manage the increased volume and speed of traffic. We do not however feel confident that this will be the case.

c) An increase of numbers in the community will have an impact on local shops, which could be beneficial to the economy, but the extra business will be accompanied by further parking and traffic problems, which are already at times overwhelming along the A660 in Adel, leading to significant road safety concerns.

d) GP facilities in Adel are said to be inadequate to cope with the current number of patients, and could not provide an adequate service for an influx of new patients.

e) There is concern that the older members of the community will be unable to stay in the area because of a lack of public transport services to local facilities and the fact that there appear to be no requirement on developers to build properties of a suitable size for those living in the larger properties in the area to downsize to.

f) There is no central local outdoor play-space for young people in Adel, and sadly, spaces do not seem to have been incorporated in the design plans for Bodington, Government Buildings nor Centurion Fields.

We would like your assurance that all these issues will be addressed and look forward to hearing further from you..

North Comments

Name: Perry

Representor No: PRS00963 **Representation ID:** REP02998

Question Ref: G17

The land should be left as Green Space. Do we really need more houses in this Area. There are a number of Developments locally (Centurion Fields & The Boddington Hall Site). To Develop this land would impact wildlife and would stop people using their allotments for relaxation and socialising.

North Comments

Name: Perry

Representor No: PRS00963 **Representation ID:** REP03007

Question Ref: G17

The Land Should be left as it is. We are losing too much green to concrete bricks and tarmac. There are old industrial sites that could be regenerated. Green is to be seen, not hidden under houses. Alotments help with fitness, out door health and relaxation when working the land. There are plenty of empty houses that could be re-worked and used again. Using this land is not the best option.

North Comments

Name: Nicola Perry

Representor No: PRS01273 **Representation ID:** REP03379

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Cookridge is already over crowded and we do not have the facilities/capacity to cope with the addition of more houses/households. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. The potential addition of 400 vehicles will exacerbate the existing problems cookridge has regarding traffic especially around the school (dangerous) and Tesco's. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. As a resident I am fully aware of the difficulty already involved with getting a doctors appointment within 2 weeks of needing one, New housing developments with no plans for more medical facilities will make this worse as hundreds more residents will swamp the already over burdened facilities. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Run off of water from the new development will increase flooding of Moseley Wood beck and inevitably cause flooding on the railway track between Harrogate and Leeds. This will affect commuters not just from cookridge but also North Leeds and North Yorkshire. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. My House has an outlook over Moseley wood bottom and we are lucky enough various species of wildlife including some endangered species. The UK government department for environment food and rural affairs have stated in their recent 'protecting biodiversity and ecosystems at home and abroad' policy (June 12/2013) that contact with nature is good for our physical and mental health, (something the new building development would surely hinder) furthermore they have stated that in England much of our biodiversity including many of our birds, butterflies and plants is declining due to wildlife areas being too disjointed (something the new housing development will contribute to). The policy stresses the importance of preserving natural ecosystems in England something a new housing development clearly goes against.

North Comments

Name: S P Perry

Representor No: PRS01600 Representation ID: REP03752

Question Ref: H1

1199 -

I strongly oppose the plans to build on the above mentioned site. Should the development proceed it would have a wide impact upon all Cookridge residents and not just those who live on Moseley Wood Gardens and the Rise.

Here are just some of the issues that this development would create:

We do not have the infrastructure to support a development of this size.

The proposed vehicular access is to be from Moseley Wood Rise. This leads onto MW Gardens and then up through the estate before reaching the main road. All these roads are relatively narrow, some winding and some steep with blind bends with cars often parked on both sides of the road.

This reduces the access space particularly for larger vehicles. Furthermore, it is not easy for emergency service vehicles to navigate these already busy roads. Another 200 or more cars will seriously add to the existing problems. There has been talk (by Taylor Wimpey) of an emergency access point being created in Cookridge Drive which appears to highlight that there are access issues generally.

In previous winter months, the roads in Cookridge have been difficult and sometimes impossible to utilise due to snow and ice. Cookridge is a very high point in Leeds we are exposed to more severe snow and icy conditions. It is unlikely that the planning advisors/officers or inspectors have experienced the severe weather conditions in Cookridge first hand and it is important to emphasise that they differ greatly to those in the city centre. This year we had several issues with the buses unable to run further than the top of Tinshill due to bad weather conditions. Cars are often left abandoned on the road, adding an increase in cars on the estate will just exacerbate the problem making it dangerous for other drivers and pedestrians. A further example highlighting the problematic nature of winter road conditions in Cookridge is that Leeds City Council refuse collection vehicles could not access the Moseley Wood Gardens due to adverse weather conditions on numerous occasions this winter. In light of this it seems prudent to stress that the residents of the proposed development properties would be totally marooned in such conditions.

Parking is already problematic and dangerous outside of the local school, Tesco and Post Office.

Road safety is of prime concern. The problem would worsen should the development proceed.

Residents are already severely affected by the current parking situation.

The train service is already inadequate at present. Trains to Leeds are often full when the train arrives at Horsforth. This means that passengers are often required to stand for the duration of their journey into Leeds or are not able to board the train. This has a knock on effect with other train stations further up the line such as Headingley and Burley Park. Parking facilities at the station are very limited. There are existing parking problems both at the station and in the surrounding area. If the new development went ahead this would worsen with more vehicles being parked on the roads in Cookridge, causing even more congestion and more passengers to add to the already strained services.

Moseley Wood Gardens has a concrete base. A cosmetic layer of tarmac is periodically applied. Extra traffic will have an impact. Heavy plant used during site construction will create further damage to the concrete base and the road will require constant attention.

The primary schools in Cookridge and Ireland Wood are all oversubscribed. It is understood that no provision has been made for a new school in the new development. Where would the children from the new estate go to school?

Doctors and dentists in the area are already oversubscribed, adding 400 residents to these services will have an impact. Where do these people register? It is already difficult to get a doctor's appointment.

According to the site allocation online plan, the vast majority of this site is in floodzone 1 (low Risk).

The report does also mention part of the site to be in flood zone 3 (non-development area). The implications of this need to be considered in further detail as the site is prone to flooding (picture provided). I am also aware that you have been sent video footage showing the flooding on the road at Moseley Wood Gardens. The development would create more surface water from the roads and concreted areas with less space to absorb the water. Moreover the site is of a sloping nature with a beck and underground spring running through which would unescapably aggravate the drainage issues.

The gardens of the existing properties in Moseley Wood Gardens are prone to flooding with heavy rainfall. The development will create a situation where our gardens will become more prone to frequent flooding due to surface run off from the new roads and drives if this land is allowed to be developed.

The railway line near to the site has been flooded in the past causing delays to passengers, again the development would add to this flooding situation.

It is well-known that the site at Moseley Wood Bottom is a haven for nature and wildlife. The beck, trees, hedgerows and grassland/meadows create a wonderful habitat for a diverse and valuable variety of wildlife. We have sighted bats, badgers, fox, deer, toads, frogs, newts (great crested) and owls to name just a few. The site is currently home to a herd of sheep and has been so for many years. It is nature at its best and gives a feel good factor to those who live in and around the area. For this to be taken away would alter the balance of life in a detrimental way. Once it's gone its gone do you want to be responsible for the loss of such valuable assets?

It is important that the Council make sure that brownfield sites are developed first before any other sites are considered. I would much prefer that the council used new powers given to it by the government to bring empty homes back into use before destroying our beautiful countryside. If houses have to be built, choose a site that is big enough to accommodate a whole new purpose built village where full services could be provided such as schools, doctors, dentist's shops, and community buildings. This would provide employment for many residents. The only employment to be gained on the proposed site in Cookridge would be in the development and building of the site, thereafter no further new employment would arise as no shops, offices, doctors, dentists, schools,

North Comments

Name: S P Perry

Representor No: PRS01600 **Representation ID:** REP03752

library, community buildings or allotments have been included in the plans proposed by the builders. It seems that profit is of the highest concern and not the well-being of the village as a whole. How can this site be deemed as GREEN as it is far short of what is required in order to build/maintain a happy and healthy community. Please change this to RED status.

North Comments

Name: John Perry

Representor No: PRS05469 Representation ID: REP06100

Question Ref: H1

The following points are some of the reasons why I am against any proposed development on the land at Moseley Wood Bottom and adjacent to Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge.

1. There is a development plan for around 200 dwellings. Such a development could possibly generate up to 400 to 500 additional cars on the roads around Cookridge. I do not feel that we have the infrastructure to cope with the additional road traffic.
2. The public transport will be at breaking point with the additional capacity.
3. The existing roads in Moseley Wood Gardens have a concrete base. The thin layer of tarmac, periodically applied, is purely cosmetic. The roads should be re-constructed from scratch. Additional traffic will mean that existing roads will require constant attention. The heavy traffic from a site development will damage the concrete base further, and the remedy will be more "patching"
4. Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times. That situation will worsen with the additional traffic from a new development in the Moseley Woods. Woodhill Road will be badly affected especially at the junction with Tinshill road, during peak times. We have heavy traffic from Harrogate, Otley and other outlying areas using Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route in to and out of Leeds. Traffic flow won't improve with any additional local traffic.
5. The "new development" will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. The traffic from the new estate will add substantially to the winter chaos. Roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Moseley Wood Gardens in the winter.
6. Allegedly, Cookridge Fire Station may close – that thought is disconcerting for existing residents in the area without considering additional new dwellings and people.
7. There are an inadequate number of local shops and facilities in the area. Parking can be very problematic outside of the local Cookridge Tesco. This must be a nightmare for those who live adjacent to the Tesco store. That situation will not improve with any new Cookridge development.
8. There are inadequate facilities for young people - one very small park on the opposite side of a busy Otley Old Road.
9. Public transport to and from Horsforth and Cookridge should be vastly improved i.e. the trains. The number of available carriages, and the quality of the trains to and from Horsforth - at peak times - needs to be examined. There is a negligible amount of parking at Horsforth Train Station. The station is not within easy walking distance for most people in the Moseley Woods. The parking problems will be compounded by a potential new development in Cookridge. The situation won't be helped by those who travel by car from outside Leeds who then use the roads around the station to abandon their cars, before hopping onto the local train. Without vastly improving the public transport the road traffic problems will increase with any new development.
10. The development in Cookridge will impact on local school.
11. The glorious countryside of Cookridge will be destroyed – but I'm guessing that is a very weak argument where planning and profit is concerned.
12. The small community feel that Cookridge Village has - will be lost.
13. The area may become a less desirable place to live. There may be better options as resources become over-stretched, and Cookridge becomes much busier.
14. In my opinion houses will generally de-value in Cookridge as a result of the development. Cookridge will lose its appeal. There will be a considerable period of disruption during construction for those factors to develop.
15. The noise from Leeds Bradford airport will and is increasing as the number of flights increase. Why build a development overlooking the end of a runway?
16. The privacy of existing residents will be affected by new houses that will directly overlook existing properties.

Meetings may be useful to a point and I realise that there are procedures but are the Councilors in a position to communicate directly with the planning Committee at Leeds City council in order to present arguments against land development in Cookridge (assuming you truly oppose such a plan)?

Should planning permission be granted for the development of the land at Moseley Wood Bottom are the Councilors in a position to object in both Leeds and London on behalf of the local community thereby forcing the decision to appeal?

North Comments

Name: John Perry

Representor No: PRS05469 **Representation ID:** REP06175

Question Ref: H1

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

Site Ref No 1199. Moseley Wood Bottom (Land off Moseley Wood Gardens)

I would like to object to the Council's designation of the above site which is currently GREEN for the following reasons.

1. A housing development of this size (around 200 houses) in this location will generate a substantial amount of additional traffic through the Moseley Woods.
2. We (Cookridge) do not have the infrastructure to be able to cope with a development of this size. Access roads are far too narrow, and the existing on road parking will further hinder safe navigation for emergency vehicles.
3. Taylor Wimpey revealed (at their public meeting on Thursday 27th June at Cookridge Village Hall) that there will be a single point of access and egress from their potential new development . This is absolutely not adequate. Traffic will be funnelled into one area of the existing estate. A second potential access point in Cookridge drive would not help the situation due to the number of cars that park along Cookridge drive, and especially in winter months. There has been talk (by Taylor Wimpey) of an emergency access point being created in Cookridge drive which appears to highlight the fact that there are access issues generally.
4. Many roads in the Moseley Woods have a concrete base. A 'cosmetic layer of tarmac' is periodically applied. The extra traffic will have an impact. The roads in the area were never designed to support such a large amount of traffic. Streets will require constant attention (they are already in an extremely poor state of repair). The top edge of many kerbs are at the same level as the roads. Heavy plant used during site construction will structurally damage the concrete base. They will need major repairs and not just patching.
5. Woodhill Road is extremely busy with commuter traffic especially at peak times. The junction at Woodhill Road/Tinshill Road is extremely busy. Tinshill Road as it approaches the bridge at Horsforth train station is difficult to navigate as people use the public house car park as a 'drop off' point for the station. Parking spaces have been created along the sides of the road but there is simply not enough parking for rail commuters. Most of the spaces are taken by people who use the train but live outside of the area. The situation will worsen substantially with the new development.

Woodhill Road is very steep at the junction with Tinshill Road and is difficult and dangerous to navigate in winter due to snow and ice. Any increase in the amount of traffic will affect safety and the difficulty of exiting Woodhill Road at this junction.
6. Commuters from Harrogate, Otley and outlying areas use Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route. Additional local traffic from a new estate will add to the problems.
7. The speed bumps on Cookridge Lane force many cars to "rat run" through the estate. Any additional traffic from a new development will add to this problem. Tinshill drive is affected by cars avoiding the speed bumps (Cookridge Primary School is situated on Tinshill Drive). More traffic will traverse Tinshill Drive en route to the proposed site at Moseley Wood Bottom (Moseley Wood Gardens).
8. The development will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. Traffic from a new development will add substantially to the winter chaos. Side roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Cookridge (Moseley Wood Gardens) in the winter months. Cars tend to be parked along Cookridge Drive in Winter months to avoid becoming stranded with the snow. Cookridge Drive will be difficult and dangerous to navigate when Taylor Wimpey propose adding Cookridge Drive as a second access point to their development in the Moseley Woods.
9. The development will have an impact on the local schools, Holy Trinity C of E Primary and Cookridge Primary School are currently over subscribed. There are not enough school places for the children who are members of the existing community. There is no logic in adding to this issue. It will create additional stress for parents and affect the quality of the service provided by the local schools, therefore affecting the futures of the students. Ireland Wood Primary School is also over subscribed
10. Parking is both problematic and dangerous outside of the local School, Tesco and the Post Office on Green Lane. Road safety is of prime concern to local Residents. The problems will worsen with a new development. Residents on Green Lane and Kirkwood Drive, are severely affected by the current situation. Because of the sheer volume of traffic at peak times, cars park on pavements and ignore road markings. Developing the Moseley Wood Bottom site will add to the problem.
11. The train service between Leeds and Horsforth is questionable. A minimum number of carriages are provided at peak times (normally two carriages). These carriages carry passengers not just to Horsforth but to Harrogate and beyond. There is not enough capacity at peak times to cope with the current numbers of passengers. The parking provided at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate for local people because it also has to cater for commuters from outside of the area. The station car park is difficult to enter and exit at peak times – being only just a little larger than one car width at its entrance. Many commuters travel by car from outside of Leeds, park their vehicles on the streets around the station, and use the local train to commute to and from the centre of Leeds. Extra housing will add substantially to these problems.
12. There is concern over the overall inadequacy of the current public transport system in the area and there is poor connectivity to a number of key locations in the city. As a result of this issue and a number of others I totally agree with the consensus of opinion that this development would neither be environmentally or socially sustainable.
13. Flooding will become a problem to the railway line from surface run off, causing delays. There will be drainage issues from the slope of the land and from the rest of Cookridge down to these fields.
14. The field behind Moseley Wood gardens is not flat. There is a visible slope from the Cookridge Lane end of the field down to the beck and the land sits at a higher level than the gardens of the existing properties. No instruments are required to prove that the land slopes. The gardens of the existing properties are prone to flooding with heavy rainfall and this potential new development will create a situation where our gardens will become more prone to frequent flooding due to the surface run off from the new roads and drives if this land is allowed to be developed.

North Comments

Name: John Perry

Representor No: PRS05469 Representation ID: REP06175

15. There are issues from airport noise that will increase as Leeds Bradford Airport expands it's service. Is it environmentally correct to allow a new development to go ahead on a site that overlooks the main runway at Leeds Bradford Airport?

16. Development of this site will be adding to urban sprawl.

17. The countryside adjacent to Cookridge will be destroyed along with the ecology. There is a plethora of wildlife that occupies or visits this area, including Red Kites, Deer, newts and frogs.

18. There are many brown sites within Leeds that could easily accommodate these 200+ extra houses.

19. There are serious doubts as to the affordability of the types of houses that are proposed be built on this site by Taylor Wimpey as demonstrated at their public meeting

20. As revealed by Taylor Wimpey at their public meeting – this will be a six year phased project. That will mean an introduction of six years of noise and disruption for a quiet and peaceful part of urban Leeds. This proposed development is too close to a well established residential area.

21. There has been mention that Cookridge fire station may close. That means it will take longer for services to reach Cookridge and due to the development it will be more difficult to access the estate and the proposed new development will be even harder to reach due to inadequate access.

I would be in support of some 'red sites' in the area being marked for potential development if they are situated adjacent to main roads, can be accessed without cutting through existing residential areas, and will have better access in winter being situated on high and level ground. They would not have to contend with the future problems of access to Moseley Wood Bottom in the winter months. Larger red sites could accommodate new schools and facilities necessary for the community. However any development in this area will add to the current traffic and transport problems unless the infrastructure is improved.

It is my view that the Council should prioritise building on brownfield sites throughout the city first before any consideration is given to any of the green field/green belt sites.

I would like to see the development of this site (Moseley Wood Bottom) deferred for at least another 20 years.

North Comments

Name: John Perry

Representor No: PRS05469 Representation ID: REP06666

Question Ref: H1

I am writing regarding the sites across Leeds that have been identified as potential sites for housing developments and in particular Site Ref No 1199. Moseley Wood Bottom (Land off Moseley Wood Gardens)

I would like to object to the Council's designation of the above site, and ultimately to Taylor Wimpey's planned development of the site for the following reasons.

1. A housing development of this size (around 200 plus houses), in this location will generate a substantial amount of additional traffic through the highly residential areas of Cookridge.

2. Cookridge and its immediate areas do not have the infrastructure to cope with additional housing. Streets are generally much too narrow. The existing on road parking will further hinder safe navigation for emergency vehicles. This point was demonstrated in July when an elderly resident needed an ambulance. The vehicle had to park some distance away from the patient and paramedics had to continue on foot. There has to be records of such incidents involving the emergency services.

3. Taylor Wimpey revealed (at their public meeting on Thursday 27th June at Cookridge Village Hall) that there will be a single point of access and egress from their potential new development that is Moseley Wood Rise. The feeling throughout the community is that this is not adequate. We are predicting that Taylor Wimpey will circumvent such arguments by suggesting that the bottom end of Cookridge Drive be used for additional access. With the current proposal, traffic will filter, through the estate, to Moseley Wood Rise – the single point of Access. A second access point in Cookridge drive would not help the situation. The majority of householders choose to park on the road as opposed to their drives restricting the road to almost a single carriage. Many cars from the lower lying parts of the estate park along Cookridge Drive in winter whenever there is the possibility of snow and ice. The fact that Taylor Wimpey are suggesting creating at least an emergency access point into Cookridge Drive, to me, highlights the fact that someone is admitting that access to this housing development is already an issue.

4. Many roads in the Moseley Woods have a concrete base. A 'cosmetic layer of tarmac' is periodically applied. The extra traffic will have an impact. It's an opinion but roads in Cookridge were not designed to support the current weight and volume of traffic. Our streets will require constant attention, and are indeed already in a poor state of repair in places. Heavy plant used during site construction will structurally damage the concrete base beyond cosmetic repair. Some roads will require major repairs and not just patching.

5. Woodhill Road is extremely busy with commuter traffic at peak times. The junction of Woodhill Road and Tinshill Road is extremely busy and it is very difficult to exit safely from Woodhill Road onto Tinshill Road especially at peak times. Woodhill Road is very steep at the junction with Tinshill Road and proves difficult to navigate in winter due to snow and ice. Tinshill Road as it approaches the bridge at Horsforth train station is difficult to navigate and people using the public house car park as a 'drop off' point for the station, because of the shortage of parking spaces, add to congestion. Parking spaces have been created along the sides of the road but there is simply not enough parking for all rail commuters. Many of the spaces are taken by people who use the train but live outside of the area. The situation will get substantially worse with a new development.

6. Commuters from Harrogate, Otley and outlying areas use Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route. Additional local traffic from a new estate will add to that volume of traffic. We don't have the infrastructure to cope with this through traffic or the additional traffic generated by a development.

7. The speed bumps on Cookridge Lane force many cars to "rat run" through the estate. Any additional traffic from a new development will add to this problem. Tinshill drive is affected by cars avoiding the speed bumps (Cookridge Primary School is situated on Tinshill Drive). Traffic will traverse Tinshill Drive en route to the proposed site at Moseley Wood Bottom (Moseley Wood Gardens).

8. The development will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. Traffic from this development will add substantially to the winter chaos. Side roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Cookridge (Moseley Wood Gardens) in the winter months. Cars tend to be parked along Cookridge Drive in Winter months to avoid becoming stranded in the snow. Cookridge Drive will be difficult and dangerous to navigate especially if predictions are correct and Taylor Wimpey propose adding Cookridge Drive as a second access point to their development in the Moseley Woods.

9. The development will impact the local schools, Holy Trinity C of E Primary, Cookridge Primary School and Ireland Wood are currently over subscribed. There are not enough school places for the children of the existing community, creating stress for parents and quite possibly affecting the quality of the service provided by those schools.

10. Parking is problematic and dangerous outside of the local Schools, Tesco and the Post Office on Green Lane. Road safety is of prime concern to local Residents. The problems will worsen with a new development as they will also need to use these limited facilities.

Residents on Green Lane and Kirkwood Drive, are severely affected by the current situation. Because of the sheer volume of traffic at peak times, cars are forced to park on pavements and ignore road markings. Developing the Moseley Wood Bottom site will add greatly to the problems.

11. The train service between Leeds and Horsforth is questionable. A minimum number of carriages are provided at peak times (normally just two carriages). These carriages carry passengers not just to Horsforth but to Harrogate and beyond. There is not enough capacity at peak times to cope with the current numbers of passengers. The parking provided at

North Comments

Name: John Perry

Representor No: PRS05469 Representation ID: REP06666

Horsforth Station is totally inadequate for local people because it also has to cater for commuters from outside of the area. The station car park is difficult to enter and exit at peak times – being only just a little wider than one car width at it's entrance and shared with a builders merchants. Many commuters travel by car from outside of Leeds, park their vehicles on the streets around the station, and use the local train to commute to and from the centre of Leeds. There is barely enough room for buses and cars to pass each other on Tinshill Road. The "T" junction with Low Lane adjacent to the railway bridge is hazardous because of the volume and speed of the existing traffic. Double yellow lines and parking bays have not made the situation any better and it has actually forced more cars to park further up Tinshill Road, along Woodhill Road and into other residential streets. In other words the problem is slowly expanding. Extra housing will without doubt add substantially to these problems. Cookridge does not have an adequate infrastructure.

12. There is concern over the inadequacy of the current public transport system in the area, and there is poor connectivity to a number of key locations in the city that may provide jobs. As a result of this issue and a number of others I totally agree with the consensus of opinion that this development would neither be environmentally or socially sustainable.

13. The field behind Moseley Wood gardens is not flat contrary to reports. There is a large visible slope from the Cookridge Lane end of the field down to the beck and the land sits at a higher level than the gardens of the existing properties. No instruments are required to prove that the land slopes. Flooding will become a problem for the railway line from surface run off, causing delays. The low points of Cookridge are prone to excess surface run-off. Residents in Moseley Wood Gardens can see that the direction of the run-off is towards the low lying beck and the railway line. Our back gardens easily become flooded during persistent rainfall. There is a beck that runs just below the surface of the rear walls to our gardens. It is evident that this beck carries a lot of water from higher parts of Cookridge. The proposed new development will add to the amount of water. There will be drainage issues from the slope of the land and from the rest of Cookridge down to these fields as the natural drainage will be interrupted..

14. There are issues from airport noise that will increase as Leeds Bradford Airport expands it's service. Is it environmentally correct to allow a new development to go ahead on a site that overlooks the main runway at Leeds Bradford Airport?

15. Development of this site will be contributing to urban sprawl. There is no infrastructure to support the development of this site and it will add absolutely nothing to the community or help those requiring affordable housing. There is no employment to be gained apart from the possibility of a few local contractors during construction of the site. There is no long term gain apart from for the developers.

16. The countryside adjacent to Cookridge will be destroyed along with the ecology. There is a plethora of wildlife that occupies and visits this area, including Red Kites, Deer, crested newts and frogs. This is beautiful countryside and not wasteland. This site should not be considered for development before all brownfield sites have been developed. Developers have the funds to really help in tidying up the brownfield sites in and around the centre of Leeds and build affordable housing. There are many brown sites within Leeds that could easily accommodate the 200+ extra houses that Taylor Wimpey propose to build in Cookridge. However I realise that Cookridge is a more tempting proposition, and an opportunity to build expensive dwellings that will easily sell. There are serious doubts as to the affordability of the types of houses that are proposed be built on this site by Taylor Wimpey as demonstrated at their public meeting.

17. As revealed by Taylor Wimpey at their public meeting – this will be a six year phased project. That will mean an introduction of six years of noise and disruption for a quiet and peaceful part of urban Leeds. This proposed development is too close to a well established residential area. There has to be noise thresholds when combined with the existing noise generated by the airport.

18. There has been talk that Cookridge fire station may close. It will take longer for services to reach Cookridge based on where the nearest services would be located. The proposed development will be more difficult to access due to inadequate access through the Moseley Woods.

I would be in support of some 'red sites' in the area being marked for potential development if they are situated adjacent to main roads, can be accessed without cutting through existing residential areas, and will have better access in winter being situated on high and level ground. They would not have to contend with the future problems of access to Moseley Wood Bottom in the winter months. Larger red sites could accommodate new schools and facilities necessary for the community. However any development in this area will add to the current traffic and transport problems unless the infrastructure is improved. The Government site on Otley Road (REF: 1033) LS16 5PU and LS16 2PU would be a better propositions in terms of access to main roads and the new trolley bus services.

It is my view that the Council should prioritise building on brownfield sites throughout the city first before any consideration is given to any of the green field/green belt sites.

I ask that the council re-considers the allocation of this site as a green site and re-allocates this site to RED – no development.

North Comments

Name: John Perry

Representor No: PRS05469 **Representation ID:** REP07289

Question Ref: H1

1199 Mosley Bottom GREEN TO RED.

This clip has been sent by [x].

You can clearly see that when we have substantial rain Moseley Wood Gardens turns into a river and the flow of water is toward the beck and railway line. We've witnessed that many times. The water flows through the gardens from the direction of Tinshill Road and into Moseley wood Gardens.

Running directly along the back wall of my garden [x] is a beck that joins the one near the railway line. That beck lies about 2 Feet below the surface and in heavy rain we've seen it turn into a river. Water from the higher surrounding land flows into that beck.

I don't know if this is useful information - but I heard from a neighbour that in the original construction of many of the houses in Cookridge they had to use dynamite to clear the rock that lies just below the surface. It took over a week to create the foundations of one of the extensions to my house due to the Sandstone that had to be removed. I'm not sure if they surveyed below the surface as well as on top on behalf of Taylor Wimpey. The sandstone must have a bearing on the amount of surface water that is generated when it rains.

I can get still frames from the movie clip if you need them.

Thanks

North Comments

Name: Sylvia Petty

Representor No: PRS02345 **Representation ID:** REP04596

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Elizabeth Petty

Representor No: PRS02555 **Representation ID:** REP04841

Question Ref: H1

- 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Elizabeth Petty

Representor No: PRS02555 Representation ID: REP04841

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Elizabeth Petty

Representor No: PRS02555 Representation ID: REP04841

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Elizabeth Petty

Representor No: PRS02555 **Representation ID:** REP04841

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Elizabeth Petty

Representor No: PRS02555 Representation ID: REP04841

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Elizabeth Petty

Representor No: PRS02555 Representation ID: REP04841

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Elizabeth Petty

Representor No: PRS02555 **Representation ID:** REP04841

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Donald Pickard

Representor No: PRS01005 Representation ID: REP03056

Question Ref: H4

1202 - I do NOT agree that this site 1202 is suitable for housing.

Reasons:-

1. The field is an amenity much used and needed by local residents as access to the countryside. We need to protect every bit of open countryside that we can.
2. There will be a lack of room in the local schools especially when we are talking about 185 houses with one, two or whatever children.
3. The roads at present are already busy with traffic but with 185 houses with at least one car per house I dread to think of the outcome.

North Comments

Name: Donald Pickard

Representor No: PRS01005 **Representation ID:** REP03118

Question Ref: H7

1310 - I do NOT agree that this land 1310 is suitable for building

North Comments

Name: Penelope Picken

Representor No: PRS01481 Representation ID: REP03617

Question Ref: G10

1019 Gledhow Valley Road

This land should be retained as greenspace. It is identified as such within the Gledhow Valley Conservation Area. It is totally unsuitable for housing, both environmentally and because of traffic implications.

North Comments

Name: Roy And Patricia Pickering

Representor No: PRS02622 Representation ID: REP04924

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Roy And Patricia Pickering

Representor No: PRS02622 Representation ID: REP04924

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Roy And Patricia Pickering

Representor No: PRS02622 Representation ID: REP04924

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites

North Comments

Name: Roy And Patricia Pickering

Representor No: PRS02622 Representation ID: REP04924

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Roy And Patricia Pickering

Representor No: PRS02622 Representation ID: REP04924

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided..., then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Roy And Patricia Pickering

Representor No: PRS02622 **Representation ID:** REP04924

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: F B Pickett

Representor No: PRS00315 Representation ID: REP02259

Question Ref: H7

"1310 Land at Outwood Lane, Hopsforth"

I am writing to agree that the above site is NOT suitable for housing. The reasons for this, which -have been put forward many times, are 1) The narrowness of Outwood Lane

2) Access to the site for Emergency Services

3) This is now a Conservation Area

4) 121 properties means 121 cars exiting on to narrow, bendy Outwood Lane.

I trust the above will be taken into account when finally deciding about the Outwood Lane site.

North Comments

Name: R Pidd

Representor No: PRS01886 **Representation ID:** REP04060

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. Already full. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: David Pilbeam

Representor No: PRS02803 Representation ID: REP05367

Question Ref: H1

1255B - objection to green. Should be red.

1255B Banksfield Mount, Yeadon. Site should not be developed for same reasons as 1255A plus issues with traffic using residential streets within an estate to access site.

Question Ref: H1

3366 - concerns

3366 Harrogate Road, Yeadon. Concerns regarding impact on road network.

Question Ref: H7

3326 - agree with red.

3326 Land North of Bayton Lane, Yeadon. Agree this site should not be developed because of SEGI

Question Ref: H7

1255A - agree with red

1255A Banksfield Mount, Yeadon. Agree site should not be developed for the reasons stated.

Question Ref: H7

3034 - agree with red.

3034 Cold Harbour Farm/Bayton Lane, Yeadon. Agree this site should not be developed because of loss of highly visible green belt which acts as a buffer between settlements along with major access issues.

Question Ref: H7

3030 - agree with red.

3030 Yeadon Banks, Yeadon. As a common this area should not have been included in the proposals.

Question Ref: H7

2118 - agree with red.

2118 Haw Lane, Yeadon. As a common this area should not have been included in the proposals.

Question Ref: General comment

Yeadon, as part of the Aireborough (and the wider Aire/Wharfe Valley) area has seen a significant amount of development over the last few years with little if any additions to the support infrastructure these developments need.

These developments have put an intolerable strain on local services which are all running at or in some cases beyond accepted capacity. There seems to be little or no recognition of this in the Council's proposals.

We should like to make the following comments.

1. As a general principle we believe the premise on which the housing numbers is based is flawed in that it makes wrong assumptions concerning population, demand and ability of developers to build.
2. We also believe it fails to deal with the questions of sustainability in that it makes no provision for infrastructure development, (schools, services, public transport, roads etc) but seems to assume that the existing networks will cope with any additional demand.
3. We believe there should be a presumption against loss of green fields in favour of re-use of existing brown field sites.
4. If there has to be some new housing it should reflect the needs of the local population rather than the profit margins of house builders. The Council/developers should provide an evidence base for the need for a development.
5. There needs to be recognition of the scale of recent housing developments in the area.
6. There needs to be recognition of the number of permissions which have not been built out (eg Highroyds).
7. There needs to be recognition of the high level of windfall sites which have come on the market in recent years.

North Comments

Name: David Pilbeam

Representor No: PRS02803 Representation ID: REP06605

Question Ref: H1

1255B Banksfield Mount, Yeadon. Site should not be developed for same reasons as 1255A plus issues with traffic using residential streets within an estate to access site

Question Ref: H7

3034 Cold Harbour Farm/Bayton Lane, Yeadon. Agree this site should not be developed because of loss of highly visible green belt which acts as a buffer between settlements along with major access issues.

Question Ref: H7

3326 Land North of Bayton Lane, Yeadon. Agree this site should not be developed because of SEGI

Question Ref: H7

2118 /3030 Haw Lane/Yeadon Banks, Yeadon. As a common this area should not have been included in the proposals.

Question Ref: H7

1255A Banksfield Mount, Yeadon. Agree site should not be developed for the reasons stated.

Question Ref: General comment

Housing issues and options

Yeadon, as part of the Aireborough (and the wider Aire/Wharfe Valley) area has seen a significant amount of development over the last few years with little if any additions to the support infrastructure these developments need.

These developments have put an intolerable strain on local services which are all running at or in some cases beyond accepted capacity. There seems to be little or no recognition of this in the Council's proposals.

We should like to make the following comments.

1. As a general principle we believe the premise on which the housing numbers is based is flawed in that it makes wrong assumptions concerning population, demand and ability of developers to build.
2. We also believe it fails to deal with the questions of sustainability in that it makes no provision for infrastructure development, (schools, services, public transport, roads etc) but seems to assume that the existing networks will cope with any additional demand.
3. We believe there should be a presumption against loss of green fields in favour of re-use of existing brown field sites.
4. If there has to be some new housing it should reflect the needs of the local population rather than the profit margins of house builders. The Council/developers should provide an evidence base for the need for a development.
5. There needs to be recognition of the scale of recent housing developments in the area.
6. There needs to be recognition of the number of permissions which have not been built out (eg Highroyds).
7. There needs to be recognition of the high level of windfall sites which have come on the market in recent years.

North Comments

Name: Norah Pinder

Representor No: PRS00597 **Representation ID:** REP02577

Question Ref: G17

2055 The green space Carr Manor Meanwood should definitely be kept in its present form, providing light and fresh air to the area to the benefit of the health of the residents. Trees greenery, etc is also essential for pleasant surroundings supporting wild life which people are interested in. The allotments sre well inside and I belive extended little while ago, so demand for producing own fresh vegatables, flowers, etc, is there and allotments would be much missed. The allotments do keep to keep that area cared for and pleasant and quiet.

More housing in the area proposed Carr Manor Crescent/Stonegate Road would be a serious congestion problems adding to traffic in the area of Carr Manor Crescent/Stonegate Road. It is already difficult to drive in and out of Carr Manor Crescent/Stonegate Road, it is very busy junction and unfortunately used as a through road to Carr Manor Road/Scott Hall Road. All extremely busy roads, most of it at speed despite the recent 20 mile restriction . Carr Manor School also generates a lot of traffic congestion at the end of the Carr Manor Crescent during certain school itineraries. Of course a large school does mean a lot of young people around from time to time too.

North Comments

Name: Robert Pitts

Representor No: PRS01523 **Representation ID:** REP03665

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Strongly agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Daniel Plant

Representor No: PRS00592 **Representation ID:** REP02575

Question Ref: G17

2055 . I think this land should be retained as a green space and not used for housing. The judges house, gardens and allotments should be retained as a community resource and allowing wildlife maintaining a foothold.

North Comments

Name: Christopher Plant

Representor No: PRS00606 Representation ID: REP02572

Question Ref: G17

2055 I Think this land should be retained as a green space and not used for housing. The sudgen House, gardens and allotments should be retained as a community resource and allowing wildlife maintaining a foothold.

North Comments

Name: Harry Plowright

Representor No: PRS00781 Representation ID: REP02792

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem

Strongly agree

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Sandra Plowright

Representor No: PRS00782 Representation ID: REP02793

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem

Strongly agree

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Matthew Pollard

Representor No: PRS01615 Representation ID: REP03767

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments- Strongly agree. Before any developments can be considered, thought needs to go into infrastructure; roads, schools, doctors, traffic ec. No need for this development

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem- Strongly agree. 200 houses with 2 cars each will create too much traffic

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly Agree. It takes too long now to get a doctors appointment

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this- Strongly agree. Rail track have genuine concerns re: flooding

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Christine Pollard

Representor No: PRS01681 **Representation ID:** REP03839

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments- Strongly agree. There is not the infrastructure to support large number of extra residents

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem- Strongly agree. Green Lane already very busy, cannot take extra traffic

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly Agree. Excellent local services will be jeopardised

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this- Strongly agree.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Maralyn Pollard

Representor No: PRS04052 **Representation ID:** REP00776

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

See next question for detailed response

Question Ref: H2

Site 1199 Land off Moseley Wood Gardens. A new housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic.. There is not the road infrastructure to cope with this additional traffic.. Moseley Wood Gardens is used as a ratrun by commuters from Bramhope area taking a short cut to Horsforth and the Ring Road.. The proposed development will have an impact on local schools. School places will become an issue. Parking at Cookridge Holy Trinity Primary School is already very problematic.. Parking at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate and so would not help ease the problem of extra road traffic.. Historically, flooding on the land in question has been an issue affecting the rail track between Bramhope Tunnel and Horsforth Station.. The land in question is a haven for wildlife and housing development will have a seriously detrimental effect.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

North Comments

Name: Richard Andrew Pollard

Representor No: PRS04213 Representation ID: REP00773

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

See the next question (H2) for main reasons

Question Ref: H2

Site 1199 Land off Moseley Wood Gardens. A new housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic.. There is not the road infrastructure to cope with this additional traffic.. Moseley Wood Gardens is used as a ratrun by commuters from Bramhope area taking a short cut to Horsforth and the Ring Road.. The proposed development will have an impact on local schools. As a retired teacher who taught at Cookridge Holy Trinity Primary School for 36 years, I am well aware of the pressure on local school places.. Parking at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate and so would not help ease the problem of extra road traffic.. Historically, flooding on the land in question has been an issue affecting the rail track between Bramhope Tunnel and Horsforth Station.. The land in question is a haven for wildlife and housing development will have a seriously detrimental effect.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

North Comments

Name: Anne Ponsford

Representor No: PRS02390 **Representation ID:** REP04647

Question Ref: G17

To be Retained as Green Space for all allotments, as at present.

North Comments

Name: Nigel Ponsford

Representor No: PRS02392 **Representation ID:** REP04649

Question Ref: G17

Retain as green space - as allotments, as at present.

North Comments

Name: N Poole

Representor No: PRS02189 **Representation ID:** REP04421

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Green Lane is already a busy road Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Lydsey Porter

Representor No: PRS01441 **Representation ID:** REP03572

Question Ref: H1

I am writing in support of the Cookridge Residents' Action Group and out of personal concern about Taylor Wimpey's proposed plans for building at Moseley Wood Bottom.

As a long time resident of Cookridge Drive I have already noticed significant increased traffic and disturbance (including heavy vehicles) following the installation of speed humps on Otley Old Road, resulting in a "rat run" through Cookridge Drive. I can only imagine the impact that the addition of a further 200 houses in the area will have and the congestion this will cause.

There could also be major road safety implications as there are also 20/30 learner driver companies using this road for instruction, together with the weekly cycling proficiency classes from a local primary school.

In terms of the local schools there is not only the problem that they are working to capacity and would not have room for the offspring of a further 200 families, but traffic and congestion around them is already a problem due to children travelling in from outside the area.

Not only that, but Cookridge as a small village, has only very limited services, amenities and a poor/unreliable bus service, so most households have at least one car or more and parking is already problematic. Some local shops complain that there is little enough parking even for their current customers. Access roads in the area are only designed for residential purposes and many are already in poor repair. There has been a recent problem on Cookridge Drive with a collapsed drain in the middle of the carriageway and further heavy vehicle over a prolonged period will only make matters worse.

In addition, should we really expect local residents to endure 6 years of heavy traffic and disruption on roads that are not fit for that purpose? The poor residents of Moseley Wood Rise must be devastated at the prospect.

As to the proposed site itself, there are numerous reasons why, aside from access problem this is a poor choice and was always likely to result in major objections.

The wood is a long established and much loved part of the area and a haven for wildlife and plant species that are in decline in this country. There are trees with preservation orders on them and it is easily accessible for recreational purposes.

We know that from a developer's viewpoint, they can potentially make more money than they could on a brown field site, but there have been problems with repeated flooding on areas of the proposed site over many years, so maybe they need to re-think their plans. More importantly, they will be selling houses to people in an area where there are known problems with flooding, which doesn't sound very ethical to me.

Finally, I understand that as part of its own site allocation plan Leeds City Council have only designated a small part of the overall proposed development area as having any merit in terms of housing. Whilst the Government has seen fit to decimate the planning regulations on the advice of those most likely to benefit, in this instance I would rather rely on the expertise of local planners.

North Comments

Name: Michael Lindsey Porter

Representor No: PRS01936 **Representation ID:** REP04117

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Already problems with residential parking on the roads and even grass verges - not going to get to get easier. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Will potential residents be appraised of the problems or will they just take their money! Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Greenfield sites should be a last resort, LCC should encourage/incentivise brownfield developments eg the site of the old pub "The Eyre".

North Comments

Name: Vera Potter

Representor No: PRS01299 **Representation ID:** REP03407

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments - Strongly agree. No where near enough infrastructure!
The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. There is more than enough already
Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly agree.
The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding, More building will affect this - Strongly agree.
Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Marjorie Pouch

Representor No: PRS05657 **Representation ID:** REP06320

Question Ref: H7

I wish to add my protest at the idea of building on plot 1015 in Hungar Hills. Quite apart from spoiling a beautiful green belt area, the increase in traffic it would cause would be impossible. At the moment the traffic on West End Lane and West End Rise is increasing day by day as it is used to avoid the main Leeds Road plus, of course, the traffic caused by West End School.

North Comments

Name: Susan Poulton

Representor No: PRS02481 **Representation ID:** REP04748

Question Ref: H1

[x], which is a habitat for numerous species of wild life and plants. One side has a row of mature lime trees which are about 80 feet tall with roots which must extend well into the plot itself. I have always understood that these have a preservation order on them and so are not allowed to be cut down. They also host woodpeckers, owls Jays as well as many other birds together with squirrels. Bats have also been seen for many years. Foxes not only regularly cross my/their wall but also hunt./mate within this site

North Comments

Name: Joseph Pounds

Representor No: PRS02675 Representation ID: REP05126

Question Ref: General comment

Moseley Wood Bottom 1199

The independent inspector reviewing this PAS site in 2005 stated that it would be better to extend the PAS land on its western boundary up to the railway rather than the beck. Should this development proceed in its present form and not include the portion of land between the beck and the railway (outlined in red on the enclosed plan) then it is obvious that this land would be treated as public open space and become completely unusable.

North Comments

Name: Victoria Pourzand

Representor No: PRS06300 Representation ID: REP07225

Question Ref: H4

I am writing to outline my objection to proposed development plans for the New Road Side area of Horsforth - specifically site references;

731 Victoria Avenue
1202 Newlaithes Fields
1016 Broadway Field

My objections fall under the following areas;

Green Space Allocation - development of these sites would be visually damaging to the landscape and setting, and result in a significant loss of open space for the local community

Leeds City Council's Local Velopment Framework identifies a lack of existing green space in Horsforth, particularly in the areas of Parks and Gardens, space for children and young people, and amenities. Both these sites currently provide this much needed space for the local community and any development would result in a significant loss of open space.

*These lands are particularly important for the younger and older generations in the community as they neighbour the local school, and so provide rereational space for local children, as well as long established dog walking routes via a public right of way.

* These sites are home to a range of well established trees and plant life, and neighbour existing agricultural land. Development of this lad would result in the loss of important trees and high quality agricultural land.

* The development plan identifies a lack of allotments in the Horsforth area, and it would be in greater keeping with the needs of the Development Plan, local area and its community to assign this land as green space for recreation and allotments, instead of additional housing.

Local Amenities - The Horsforth area is currently stretched to capacity in vital amenities to support its community, and the addition of further housing would have a serious and negative impact on its provision of vital services.

* Local schools are stretched to capacity, with no free places to accommodate additional children.

* There is only one Doctor's Surgery to service the entire New Road Side area, which is already over indexed in key groups requiring above average medical attention (young children and over 55's)

* The recent integration of the Horsforth and Cookridge/Holt Park children's support teams means that Health Visitor and midwife provision in the local area is already stretched.

* There has been a steady increase in the amount of burglary and theft in the area in recent months. Despite the excellent efforts of the local policing teams, the addition of new housing would place further burden on their, already stretched, resources.

* The proximity of the local Cemetery to the sites, as well as the slope of the Newlaithes fields, means that public sewers and existing groundwater management systems would be unable to effectively manage the demands of additional housing.

Local Traffic

* The A65 is the main arterial road for Guiseley, Rawdon and Horsforth to access Leeds City Centre. Traffic at the New Road side roundabout is already gridlocked at rush hour, particularly as it intersects the Ring Road. The existing road system is inadequate to support current, let alone increased, traffic demands. To place further traffic onto that roundabout would have major knock on affects for access into Leeds City Centre from the entire A65 area.

* Calverley Lane provides access to the Horsforth Campus of Leeds City College and is used by young people daily to access their education site. Placing additional housing and traffic in this area would significantly prejudice highway safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents involving young people in the area.

* Victoria Mount provides the main traffic route to Newlaithes Primary School.

Traffic on the road at school pick up and drop off times is already significant.

The bend in the road where Victoria Aveneue meets Victoria Mount is already tight and an accident risk as cars approaching from opposite directions struggle to pass safely. Adding new traffic to this point would significantly prejudice highway safety - particularly to young children accessing the school.

In summary, the New Road Side area is already stretched in its ability to support the local community that it serves- there are better sites available within the Leeds area that have the capacity to support new residents. To place additional housing in this area would push its services beyond capacity and negatively impact ALL residents. The approved plans for housing at the former Clariant site and former Police Station are already bringing a large number of new homes to the area, and means this area should be discounted from plans for further development.

North Comments

Name: Victoria Pourzand

Representor No: PRS06300 Representation ID: REP07225

Question Ref: General comment

I am writing to outline my objection to proposed development plans for the New Road Side area of Horsforth - specifically site references;

731 Victoria Avenue
1202 Newlaithes Fields
1016 Broadway Field

My objections fall under the following areas;

Green Space Allocation - development of these sites would be visually damaging to the landscape and setting, and result in a significant loss of open space for the local community

Leeds City Council's Local Velopment Framework identifies a lack of existing green space in Horsforth, particularly in the areas of Parks and Gardens, space for children and young people, and amenities. Both these sites currently provide this much needed space for the local community and any development would result in a significant loss of open space.

*These lands are particularly important for the younger and older generations in the community as they neighbour the local school, and so provide rereational space for local children, as well as long established dog walking routes via a public right of way.

* These sites are home to a range of well established trees and plant life, and neighbour existing agricultural land. Development of this lad would result in the loss of important trees and high quality agricultural land.

* The development plan identifies a lack of allotments in the Horsforth area, and it would be in greater keeping with the needs of the Development Plan, local area and its community to assign this land as green space for recreation and allotments, instead of additional housing.

Local Amenities - The Horsforth area is currently stretched to capacity in vital amenities to support its community, and the addition of further housing would have a serious and negative impact on its provision of vital services.

* Local schools are stretched to capacity, with no free places to accommodate additional children.

* There is only one Doctor's Surgery to service the entire New Road Side area, which is already over indexed in key groups requiring above average medical attention (young children and over 55's)

* The recent integration of the Horsforth and Cookridge/Holt Park children's support teams means that Health Visitor and midwife provision in the local area is already stretched.

* There has been a steady increase in the amount of burglary and theft in the area in recent months. Despite the excellent efforts of the local policing teams, the addition of new housing would place further burden on their, already stretched, resources.

* The proximity of the local Cemetery to the sites, as well as the slope of the Newlaithes fields, means that public sewers and existing groundwater management systems would be unable to effectively manage the demands of additional housing.

Local Traffic

* The A65 is the main arterial road for Guiseley, Rawdon and Horsforth to access Leeds City Centre. Traffic at the New Road side roundabout is already gridlocked at rush hour, particularly as it intersects the Ring Road. The existing road system is inadequate to support current, let alone increased, traffic demands. To place further traffic onto that roundabout would have major knock on affects for access into Leeds City Centre from the entire A65 area.

* Calverley Lane provides access to the Horsforth Campus of Leeds City College and is used by young people daily to access their education site. Placing additional housing and traffic in this area would significantly prejudice highway safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents involving young people in the area.

* Victoria Mount provides the main traffic route to Newlaithes Primary School.

Traffic on the road at school pick up and drop off times is already significant.

The bend in the road where Victoria Aveneue meets Victoria Mount is already tight and an accident risk as cars approaching from opposite directions struggle to pass safely. Adding new traffic to this point would significantly prejudice highway safety - particularly to young children accessing the school.

In summary, the New Road Side area is already stretched in its ability to support the local community that it serves- there are better sites available within the Leeds area that have the capacity to support new residents. To place additional housing in this area would push its services beyond capacity and negatively impact ALL residents. The approved plans for housing at the former Clariant site and former Police Station are already bringing a large number of new homes to the area, and means this area should be discounted from plans for further development.

North Comments

Name: Col Powell

Representor No: PRS04897 Representation ID: REP00131

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

There seems to be an abundance of existing housing and former commercial premises that could be redeveloped, without the need for building on greenbelt land.

Question Ref: H2

Highbury Cricket Ground, Meanwood, North East Hollins Drive (Ref: 1170).This area is unsuitable for housing development because of the proximity to vital conservation areas and sensitive species and habitats. There are existing TPOs on site. It would be nice, for once, if developers and planners took notice of these rather than simply taking the (meagre) financial hit.The surrounding roads could not cope with the increase in vehicles that would occur, not to mention the heavy plant machinery that would be present during construction.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Highbury Cricket Ground, Meanwood, North East Hollins Drive (1170).Same reasons as stated previously.

North Comments

Name: Raymond Pratt

Representor No: PRS02058 Representation ID: REP04264

Question Ref: H1

1199 - No - See the next question for the main reasons.

Question Ref: H2

1199 - Comments

- A housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic.
- We do not have the infrastructure to cope with the extra traffic.
- Moseley Wood Gardens has a concrete base. A cosmetic layer of tarmac is periodically applied. Extra traffic will have an impact. Streets will require constant attention. Heavy plant used during site construction will create further damage to the concrete base.
- Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times. That situation will worsen substantially with the new development.
- Commuters from Harrogate, Otley and outlying areas use Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route. Additional local traffic from a new estate will add to the problems.
- The development will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. Traffic from a new development will add substantially to the winter chaos. Roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Cookridge in winter months.
- The area will attract less people with the increased difficulties in navigating to and from Cookridge.
- The development will impact on the local schools. School places will become an issue.
- Parking is problematic and dangerous outside of the local school, Tesco and Post Office. Road safety is of prime concern. The problems will worsen with a new development. Residents are severely affected by the current situation.
- The train service is questionable. A minimum number of carriages are provided at peak times. Parking at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate for local people. Commuters travel by car from outside Leeds, park their cars on the streets around the station, and use the local train. Extra housing will compound the problems.
- There is concern over the inadequacy of the current public transport system in the area and there is poor connectivity to a number of locations in the city. As a result of this issue and a number of others this development would neither be environmentally or socially sustainable.
- Flooding may become a problem to the railway line from surface run off, causing delays.
- The countryside adjacent to Cookridge will be destroyed along with the ecology.

Question Ref: H3

3044 / 3360 - These two sites could be used to create a whole new village that would be purpose built to accommodate the increase in the number of residents who would be attracted to the area. It would be an opportunity to build a new school, shops, dental surgery, and an accessible public house within walking distance. Jobs would be created. These two sites are at a higher elevation and therefore the problems of winter would not pose such a big problem to motorists. However, there will still be issues related to public transport, parking in the vicinity of the train station, and the large increase in traffic.

North Comments

Name: Sandra Pratt

Representor No: PRS02059 Representation ID: REP04265

Question Ref: H1

1199 - No - See the next question for the main reasons.

Question Ref: H2

1199 - Comments

- A housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic.
- We do not have the infrastructure to cope with the extra traffic.
- Moseley Wood Gardens has a concrete base. A cosmetic layer of tarmac is periodically applied. Extra traffic will have an impact. Streets will require constant attention. Heavy plant used during site construction will create further damage to the concrete base.
- Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times. That situation will worsen substantially with the new development.
- Commuters from Harrogate, Otley and outlying areas use Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route. Additional local traffic from a new estate will add to the problems.
- The development will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. Traffic from a new development will add substantially to the winter chaos. Roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Cookridge in winter months.
- The area will attract less people with the increased difficulties in navigating to and from Cookridge.
- The development will impact on the local schools. School places will become an issue.
- Parking is problematic and dangerous outside of the local school, Tesco and Post Office. Road safety is of prime concern. The problems will worsen with a new development. Residents are severely affected by the current situation.
- The train service is questionable. A minimum number of carriages are provided at peak times. Parking at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate for local people. Commuters travel by car from outside Leeds, park their cars on the streets around the station, and use the local train. Extra housing will compound the problems.
- There is concern over the inadequacy of the current public transport system in the area and there is poor connectivity to a number of locations in the city. As a result of this issue and a number of others this development would neither be environmentally or socially sustainable.
- Flooding may become a problem to the railway line from surface run off, causing delays.
- The countryside adjacent to Cookridge will be destroyed along with the ecology.

This site is close to airport with much noise and pollution!

Question Ref: H3

3044 / 3360 - These two sites could be used to create a whole new village that would be purpose built to accommodate the increase in the number of residents who would be attracted to the area. It would be an opportunity to build a new school, shops, dental surgery, and an accessible public house within walking distance. Jobs would be created. These two sites are at a higher elevation and therefore the problems of winter would not pose such a big problem to motorists. However, there will still be issues related to public transport, parking in the vicinity of the train station, and the large increase in traffic.

North Comments

Name: Pamela Preston

Representor No: PRS00821 Representation ID: REP02835

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

Brownfield sites should be developed before any green belt areas.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

The access road is narrow and congested.

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

Both schools are over subscribed.

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

Will cause problems for the railway.

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

Our children's heritage is very important.

North Comments

Name: Emily Prest

Representor No: PRS01860 **Representation ID:** REP04028

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. There are plenty of houses already for sale in the area and not being sold, so why build more?. Cookridge is a lovely place to live and bring up a family. There is ano need for this. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. How can planning permission be granted where there will be only one access road to 250 houses. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Strongly, strongly, strongly agree!!!!. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Just selfish act of Taylor Wimpey to line their own pocket !! They will use "creating jobs" as an excuse. Let them build elsewhere.

North Comments

Name: Ben Pretty

Representor No: PRS04503 Representation ID: REP01613

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

The sites in Rawdon that have been allocated as green (sites 3331, 3366 and 4095) are the most suitable given that despite the fact they are green belt sites, their ability to satisfy the 5 green belt criteria is not as significant as other parts of the Rawdon green belt (such as the Rawdon Billing area). My preference would be for no Green Belt land in Rawdon to be developed but I totally accept the housing needs position and in the context of this consider that the Knott Lane and Layton Lane sites are more suitable housing sites than those identified as red. These two sites are both relatively well contained and I agree that the scale of development proposed on these sites and their location would not lead to major urban sprawl - the impact on the green belt would therefore be less through the development of these sites than others in Rawdon (such as the Rawdon Billing area). The sites are not used extensively for any purpose other than agriculture and they are both accessible to the A65 and the public transport that runs along this key arterial route. It is also relatively straightforward to access these sites through existing access points. The development of these sites would represent logical infill development and given the housing supply challenges that we face and the lack of brownfield sites in the Rawdon area that aren't already being developed, I would tend to agree that if any green belt land in Rawdon needs to be released for development then these sites would probably be key sites for considerations. Site 1308 (Naylor Jennings) is also correctly labelled 'green' as it is a key brownfield site that is ripe for redevelopment as a priority ahead of the above.

Question Ref: H3

Not applicable

Question Ref: H4

y

Question Ref: H4

Not applicable

Question Ref: H5

Not applicable

Question Ref: H6

Sites 3329, 3331 and 4095 along Layton Lane and Knott Lane should perhaps be amber not green as they are in the green belt nonetheless and still fulfil some of the key green belt roles as per the NPPF.

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

On behalf of the Rawdon Billing Action Group, I fully support and endorse the 'red' shading allocation for the Rawdon Billing area, mainly ref 3034, but also 2119. This is a significant area of green belt land which critically continues to serve all 5 purposes of green belt land as per the NPPF. PLEASE SEE THE ATTACHED REPORT WHICH I LED THE PREPARATION OF ON BEHALF OF THE RAWDON BILLING ACTION GROUP AND WHICH WAS SUBMITTED TO THE COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION IN OCTOBER 2012 - THIS SUPPORTS MY RESPONSE TO THIS QUESTION [Scanned and available as an attachment]

Rawdon Billing and its surrounding land is a significant physical landmark within the Leeds District and any development would have a serious impact on the openness of the Green Belt and result in a large area of urban sprawl, with the settlements of Rawdon, Yeadon and Horsforth effectively merging into one large settlement as an urban extension of the Leeds City conurbation. The Rawdon Billing area also serves a key role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - it is the last piece of countryside left around here and if it was to be developed then the urban boundary would be extended. Rawdon is also a very historic settlement in its own right and the Rawdon Billing is part of this overall setting of the old village of Rawdon along Town Street. Aside from just the NPPF Green Belt criteria, the land is in active economic use as agricultural land (a tenant farmer depends upon it for his livelihood) and is also a major recreational asset in constant use for this purpose. The Billing itself is a protected nature area and the land is home to a plethora of natural wildlife including a number of protected species. The land is very undulating and has also has very poor drainage. Rawdon Billing and surrounding land defines Rawdon as a settlement and provides it with a distinct USP. Rawdon's distinctiveness is at risk – it would become just another large housing estate if it lost this green asset. The local infrastructure is not sufficient to cater for major new residential development, particularly given the current A65 congestion issues and also the existing oversubscriptions at local schools and doctor/dentist surgeries. Rawdon is a sustainable village location in its own right, the village 'works' – why upset this balance? Rawdon has already sacrificed green land for development at the Airport and around Larkfield Dam. There are other more appropriate, suitable and deliverable sites for residential development within Aireborough and the Leeds District which are not designated as Green Belt – many of which are brownfield sites.

Question Ref: H8

n/a

Question Ref: H9

n/a

North Comments

Name: Ben Pretty

Representor No: PRS04503 Representation ID: REP01613

Question Ref: H10

n/a

Question Ref: H11

Sites 3329, 3331 and 4095 should all be developed in the long term as they are existing green belt sites. There are brownfield sites such as the former Clariant site and the Naylor Jennings site which should be Rawdon's short term development sites.

Question Ref: H12

No

Question Ref: H13

N/A

Question Ref: H14

N/A

Question Ref: H15

N/A

Question Ref: General comment

I would very much welcome the opportunity to discuss my views/responses further if necessary and would be happy to discuss any of this.

North Comments

Name: Keith Price

Representor No: PRS03647 Representation ID: REP01916

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Site Ref 1199 No thought has been given to the impact of the infrastructure of the area

Question Ref: H2

Site Ref 1199 Land off Moseley Wood Bottom Cookridge Adding a potential 400 cars to this area will make access difficult through the current estate, which is difficult at the best of times. The access on Moseley Wood Rise is not wide enough to take service vehicles: Why then is the council allowing a developer to take council land (verges) to make a profit. The traffic would impose a serious danger to the young children on the estate, most of them walk to the local primary school. The road surfaces are diabolical and struggle to take the wear of the existing traffic.

Question Ref: H3

Site ref 1199 The rare wild life that lives there Great Crested Newts, Herons and sightings of Red Kites

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Throughout Leeds there are many disused sites where land and old buildings can be renovated, demolished and sites to be rebuilt, in so doing rejuvenating areas rather than destroy green areas. These sites already have facilities and infrastructure around them, including utilities and access. It is difficult as a resident of the City Of Leeds to understand why the Council are not investigating these avenues when clearly been the rights by government to do so.

Question Ref: H5

Site Ref 1199 The impact on the surrounding area would be catastrophic, not only for the local residents as mentioned in H2 but for the wider area. Other than Tesco Local and a Post Office, Cookridge has no other amenities and parking around these two amenities is restricted, opposite a local primary school causing a hazard to children, pedestrians. There is provision of a doctor or dentist in Cookridge, adding 400+ residents will only add to an oversubscribed service, where do these people register?

Question Ref: H6

Site Ref 3044 It has the space to redevelop and for additional amenities to be added. It is close to a main road not through an estate.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Site ref 3044 and 3360 are good because the amount of area they cover.

Question Ref: H8

Site ref 1151 The population of Leeds is not growing so why tag on an estate to an existing one

North Comments

Name: Karen Price

Representor No: PRS04861 Representation ID: REP01924

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Site Ref 1199 The development of land has no infrastructure in the area

Question Ref: H2

Site ref 1199 Access through the current estate is very busy with multiple cars per household, with the roads already difficult to navigate. Adding 400 cars to the estate immediately cause significant congestion both to the estate and the surrounding area. The majority of residents on the estate are young families and elderly, this would increase the danger on the estate.

Question Ref: H3

Site ref 1199 The wildlife in the area would be killed off - Great Crested Newts, Herons and sightings of Red Kites.

Question Ref: H4

y

Question Ref: H4

Throughout Leeds there are so many disused sites where old buildings can be renovated demolished and sites rejuvenated, in so doing rejuvenating the surrounding area. These areas already have the infrastructure to cope with additional housing.

Question Ref: H5

Site ref 1199 - This is just a tag on to existing estate and should be put back to green belt

Question Ref: H7

n

North Comments

Name: Anna Pridmore

Representor No: PRS02290 **Representation ID:** REP04529

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom. Good quality affordable housing is needed.

Unsure if this development will increase local traffic.

Agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Unsure that the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding or if more building WILL affect this.

Agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

North Comments

Name: Colin Priestley

Representor No: PRS01238 **Representation ID:** REP03342

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. All the additional traffic cannot be added to already inadequate road. Other infrastructure and services/schools/shops etc. are lacking. Tackle brownfields sites before anywhere else should even be considered. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Existing parking will make it difficult for any extra traffic. What happens when we get lots of snow such as in last 4 winters. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. And if this is the case incomers will be forced to drive further afield adding to our traffic problems. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. More run off from roads, drives and gardens will add to this risk. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Adjoining greenbelt part of large wedge of wooded and open land from the Chevin down into Horsforth.

North Comments

Name: Faye Priestley

Representor No: PRS01240 **Representation ID:** REP03343

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The capacity of the infrastructure is at the maximum already so more housing development is not sustainable. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. There will only be one road of access to the proposed new developments so rat runs will develop not safe. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. There are limited capacities for facilities already in place eg. School places. Doctors appointments, more demand is not possible. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Building on floodplains increase risk of flooding, in turn costing more money in the long run so why spend money on flood defence when you could prevent flooding by not building the development in the first place. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. It is an area that includes water habitats, trees, fields, which are all important habitats for wildlife. Environmental conservation should be the most important consideration and it is green land, not brownfield.

North Comments

Name: Thomas Priestley

Representor No: PRS01242 **Representation ID:** REP03346

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Not enough infrastructure (school places, doctors dentists, road, etc) to sustain a larger population. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Limited road access to proposed site will greatly increase traffic problems during and after building, as well as a health risk. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Waiting times and places are limited enough at existing helath care, dentists as it is, an extra 200 properties will cause a bigger problem. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. It is clear to see that building on flood plan of Moseley Beck will limit overflow capacity. Any adverse weather condition and a flood will likely occur, flooding most improtant the railway line. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Of course it is, it consists of grass, wood, a stream where wildlife thives. What of the impact on local conservation aera such as caring for l ife?

North Comments

Name: Karen Priestley

Representor No: PRS01742 **Representation ID:** REP00078

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Lack of infrastructure in the local area.

Question Ref: H2

1199Lack of access to site. Lack of school places, poor public transport (no 6 bus), traffic congestion outside Holy Trinity School, Tesco, road junction at Woodhill Rd/Tinshill Rd. Increased traffic. Potential for further sprawl of building onto open spaces. Lack of capacity at Horsforth station.

Question Ref: H3

No

Question Ref: H4

y

Question Ref: H5

n/a

Question Ref: H6

n/a

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

115130443360As before, lack of infrastructure in Cookridge and the terrible traffic in the A660 route.

Question Ref: H8

n/a

Question Ref: H10

I think that brownfield sites should be redeveloped in advance on greenfield sites. I do not think that the type of housing that these Cookridge sites will offer will address the lack of housing for people in the most need.

Question Ref: H11

Not at all.

Question Ref: H12

No

Question Ref: H13

Don't know

Question Ref: H14

No because of the lack of infrastructure, poor public transport and the fact that Cookridge is prone to the extreme of weather conditions which affect public transport, waste collection and even being able to walk along the pavements.

Question Ref: H15

Don't know.

Question Ref: General comment

You should work from the city centre outwards before you start on the outer edges. There is nothing in Cookridge which is why we like it.

North Comments

Name: Karen Priestley

Representor No: PRS01742 **Representation ID:** REP03901

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Insufficient infrastructure to support new housing. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. The traffic is terrible at the moment and excess parking on roads, No. 6 bus terrible, Horsforth station at capacity. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. It is difficult to get a GP's appointment at Highfield Surgery. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Replacing greenfield with hard surface will cause more flooding. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. We don't need developers to provide us with open access space in place of natural habitat for birds, insects, frogs, foxes.

North Comments

Name: Alex Priestley

Representor No: PRS05289 **Representation ID:** REP05840

Question Ref: H1

1199

I would like to object to the council's designation of the site 1199 (land off Moseley Wood Gardens) as Green.

Access-

The proposed access to the housing development for Moseley Bottom would be along narrow roads already choked with parked cars making them effectively single track. 200 houses would result in at least 200 extra car trips per day making an already sub-optimal traffic situation worse.

Question Ref: H1

1199

I would like to object to the council's designation of the site 1199 (land off Moseley Wood Gardens) as Green.

Local facilities and schools-

There are already issues with oversubscription at local schools. Adding a further burden to this without the provision of extra capacity will cause the current situation to be worse. There are also no medical facilities within easy reach, and those that are nearest are oversubscribed.

Question Ref: H1

1199

I would like to object to the council's designation of the site 1199 (land off Moseley Wood Gardens) as Green.

I would suggest that this site is put back as a PAS in the development plan.

Question Ref: H1

1199

I would like to object to the council's designation of the site 1199 (land off Moseley Wood Gardens) as Green.

Ecology-

The land along Moseley Beck provides an important 'wildlife corridor' between the open countryside further out of Leeds towards Otley and Bramhope and the important woodland habitats further into Leeds such as Woodside Quarry, Hawksworth Woods etc. Developing this land would cut off this corridor. Also, the land itself provides an important habitat for a large variety of wildlife.

Question Ref: H1

1199

I would like to object to the council's designation of the site 1199 (land off Moseley Wood Gardens) as Green.

Flooding-

Network Rail already suffer issues with flooding on the railway line between Horsforth station and Bramhope tunnel. Building on this greenfield site will further exacerbate the problem as it is the only bit of land available for rainwater to percolate into the ground between most of the Cookridge area and Moseley Beck. A housing development on this site would result in much larger amounts of run-off reaching the beck in a shorter amount of time. Since most climate scientists in the UK agree that rainfall is going to become less frequent but heavier, resulting in more flash flooding, the council should be trying to increase the built environment's capacity to cope with severe weather events, rather than reducing it. Building on this land would mean Moseley Beck and the infrastructure along the valley would be likely to suffer more severe flooding more often.

Question Ref: H1

1199

I would like to object to the council's designation of the site 1199 (land off Moseley Wood Gardens) as Green.

Public transport provision-

Due to the nature of the roads discussed above, I find it unlikely that there will be sufficient public transport provision included in the development

Question Ref: H1

1199

I would like to object to the council's designation of the site 1199 (land off Moseley Wood Gardens) as Green.

Sustainability-

Building on greenfield sites does not fit in with the council's sustainability targets. Building on brownfield sites should be prioritised in every case.

North Comments

Name: Alex Priestley

Representor No: PRS05289 **Representation ID:** REP05885

Question Ref: H1

Dear Sir or Madam,

I would like to object to the council's designation of the site 1199 (land off Moseley Wood Gardens) as Green for the following reasons:

1. Access

The proposed access to the housing development for Moseley Bottom would be along narrow roads already choked with parked cars making them effectively single track. 200 houses would result in at least 200 extra car trips per day making an already sub-optimal traffic situation worse.

2. Public transport provision

Due to the nature of the roads discussed above, I find it unlikely that there will be sufficient public transport provision included in the development.

3. Local facilities and schools

There are already issues with oversubscription at local schools. Adding a further burden to this without the provision of extra capacity will cause the current situation to be worse. There are also no medical facilities within easy reach, and those that are nearest are oversubscribed.

4. Flooding

Network Rail already suffer issues with flooding on the railway line between Horsforth station and Bramhope tunnel. Building on this greenfield site will further exacerbate the problem as it is the only bit of land available for rainwater to percolate into the ground between most of the Cookridge area and Moseley Beck. A housing development on this site would result in much larger amounts of run-off reaching the beck in a shorter amount of time. Since most climate scientists in the UK agree that rainfall is going to become less frequent but heavier, resulting in more flash flooding, the council should be trying to increase the built environment's capacity to cope with severe weather events, rather than reducing it. Building on this land would mean Moseley Beck and the infrastructure along the valley would be likely to suffer more severe flooding more often.

5. Ecology

The land along Moseley Beck provides an important 'wildlife corridor' between the open countryside further out of Leeds towards Otley and Bramhope and the important woodland habitats further into Leeds such as Woodside Quarry, Hawksworth Woods etc. Developing this land would cut off this corridor.

Also, the land itself provides an important habitat for a large variety of wildlife.

6. Sustainability

Building on greenfield sites does not fit in with the council's sustainability targets. Building on brownfield sites should be prioritised in every case.

I would suggest that this site is put back as a PAS in the development plan

North Comments

Name: Frances Prior

Representor No: PRS01256 Representation ID: REP03360

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Impact on school, infrastructure & disturbance while already being built. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Mike Prior

Representor No: PRS01257 Representation ID: REP03361

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Unsure. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Susie Pritchatt

Representor No: PRS02001 **Representation ID:** REP04202

Question Ref: G17

The land is important part of our local environment and should be retained as green space.

North Comments

Name: J Pronay

Representor No: PRS02440 Representation ID: REP04701

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree Green belt is disappearing as is green land. Develop brownfield sites. Initial cost is higher, cost to the nation is reduced. Cookridge has few facilities/egress already just a mass of housing The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Development below Moseley Wood Grove has only one access - Trouble built into plan. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Agree most likely Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Agree Need specialists to identify this (West Park fields proved to have 81 species of plants including rare)

North Comments

Name: Vasoulla Psarias

Representor No: PRS03777 **Representation ID:** REP00952

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

2051A This is the only green belt between Alwoodley Lane and Eccup reservoir. Restricted access will cause traffic jams on Alwoodley Lane.

North Comments

Name: Mary Pugh

Representor No: PRS02987 **Representation ID:** REP05555

Question Ref: H7

3034, 3327, 3328 & 3330 All Red sites

Initial general concerns concerning development of these sites 3034, 3327, 3328 & 3330 are increased pressure on local amenities, schools etc. Also all these sites are not near shops or other facilities so any journeys will of necessity involve car use on already clogged roads.

Site 3330 on West End Lane has access at an awkward corner of the lane with no pavement on that side so pedestrians would have to cross the busy road at a point which gives poor visibility in both directions, to reach a pavement. Since the council has put a pavement on one side of the lane, traffic has speeded up considerably; the pavement is frequently used as road space when two vehicles meet especially if they are big lorries. Pedestrians are forced to move into driveways to avoid being hit.

The pavement also provides an excellent parking facility which forces pedestrians to walk in the road.

Access to the proposed site 3327 on Bayton Lane also appears to be potentially dangerous – near a very awkward junction which is busy throughout the day. At this point Bayton Lane has no pavement in either direction.

Proposed developments 3328 & 3034 at first sight seem less problematical as these sites could be accessed from a fairly wide stretch of road, but I am not happy at the filling in of green space in the area and the increased traffic which would inevitably ensue.

I would hope that if any of these developments do go ahead serious consideration would be given to improvements to the Bayton Lane, West End Lane, Brownberrie Lane & Layton Road junction – at least a reduction to the 40mph speed limit at that point. Residents locally would dearly like some traffic lights or a roundabout anything to make it easier to cross the junction safely in any direction.

I hope these sites continue to be regarded as not suitable for housing development.

North Comments

Name: Michael John Pullan

Representor No: PRS00051 Representation ID: REP00457

Question Ref: H1

1199 - Access is very limited- More traffic will mean children playing are more at risk- Area is used by many for walking in the countryside.

Question Ref: H7

1151 / 3044 / 3360 - Yes (agree)

North Comments

Name: Michael John Pullan

Representor No: PRS00051 Representation ID: REP04394

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom - Green to Red.

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Most concerned about traffic, schools overcrowded and public transport

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Already many potholes and cars parked on the road - more hazardous for children.

Local schools such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand, it took 12months to find a dentist in this area.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. More hard surfaces will mean water will rise if it cannot soak in.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. I walk with my dog and children nearly everyday.

North Comments

Name: Trevor Pullan

Representor No: PRS00780 Representation ID: REP02791

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem

Strongly agree

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: M Pullan

Representor No: PRS01753 **Representation ID:** REP04397

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom - Green to Red.

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. The infrastructure cannot cope especially with only one exit from the new development.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Danger to children and pedestrians public transport will also be evenmore overcrowded.

Local schools such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. I regularly walk in this area - almost every day and enjoy the countryside.

North Comments

Name: David Pye

Representor No: PRS01816 **Representation ID:** REP03947

Question Ref: H1

I cannot believe that anyone who is familiar with the Mosley Wood area could ever support the building scheme being proposed. Just to consider the location and the on-going problems we experience every winter alone. The roads are always a major issue in particular Mosley Wood Gardens. This road alone must cost the residents dearly each year in lost working hours when you just cannot move out of the area for severe road/ weather conditions. I know I have experienced loss of pay through missed working days although retired now we still have to walk out of the gardens. In many cases in the winter through the extreme conditions.

Parking has over the recent years made this much worse as the road cannot cope with the increase of cars having to park in the street. Any building work/builders vans parked on the road is causing major problems with roads blocked. This is before the excess of road traffic that will be experienced with this scheme!!!

We have already experienced school issues in the area. My grandson was without a place two years ago in a local school despite me going to a tribunal we had to a Horsforth school because there was no places. How can it possibly work with the influx the 200 houses will bring?

The school locally as major problems with dangerous situations there will be a real danger of a fatality in this area if things do not improve!! All the side roads we be like rat runs to Mosley wood Gardens. But why build on such an heaven of nature!! Why not brown field sites> Is this instructions from London without any consideration. If this goes through we are all in for an uncertain future and 5 years noise and dirt.

North Comments

Name: Paul Quarmby

Representor No: PRS05565 Representation ID: REP06215

Question Ref: H7

I was very concerned to hear in 2012 that large areas of land on and around Hunger Hills in Horsforth were being included in the Leeds Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA reference 1015). I now believe they have been discounted, but I comment to ensure they don't become included again, at appeal or at some other time. My comments are also offered in respect of other greenfield sites that might also be considered for development.

In respect of the 'Hunger Hills' area, I recall that several years ago the planning status of the Hunger Hills area was exchanged with 'The Billings' Rawdon, do I recall this was about Common Land status? I do not now see that LCC Planners can retract this public space designation.

While I do understand that housing is necessary, I have to say that I think building on 'Greenfield' sites needs to be restricted because we need the green space we have for many reasons: future opportunity to grow food; amenity benefits for people; space for wildlife and for plants.

New Housing, if needed, should be confined to construction on Brownfield sites, to existing and established Towns and in Cities. This is not just a desire of someone who lives near green space but for sustainability reasons, for the future of human and animal life in Leeds and the world.

You might consider this statement, 'in the world' to be a gross overstatement, but is it? the future of wildlife, on this planet, depends on genetic diversity, niche habitats, space to propagate, spread, transit between seasonal food sources and breeding colonies. Thus green corridors, established habitats or green land near established habitats needs to be maintained. Legislation exists in this regard in the Habitat and Birds Directive, but the options of substitution of space/ habitat within planning legislation is flawed, such regulations allowing substitution of lands will ultimately result in domesticated wild space and wildlife, and cannot replicate long and naturally established environments and habitats.

But putting aside the emotion, sustainability, a future for human kind, wildlife and plants will need corridors of wild lands to link larger spaces, to provide amenity space for people, to help purify the air, create and maintain those things that make life, possible and worth living.

The location of houses is a concern as houses bring people, children, cars, demand for services, infrastructure, schools, shops, entertainment and if these services are not likewise improved amenity for all is diminished.

Housing if constructed on lands such as Hunger Hills will not be affordable homes, the location will ensure executive homes are constructed, developers will price development as high as possible, such homes will bring two or three cars per household, this can be seen already in the surrounding estates of Southfield and West End's.

There are also, planned for the area, other large housing developments, those of 'Kirkstall Forge' and of the 'Clariant' site, both these sites will add considerably to the traffic in the area, the local shops and services, the schools, the Doctors, the Social and Health Services will also be put under strain.

The threat of Climate Change and Global Warming has resulted in EU and UK legislation limiting carbon emissions, the placement and knock on effects of housing development need to be considered in this context. Out of town housing will result in more car journeys, more CO2 emissions, more accidents, more pollutants passing into the environment.

The alternative is in the further development of Cities, densification of our established towns could offer economies, benefits of scale, benefits derived from proximity, benefits of walking and cycling, of efficient shopping delivery systems, of developing a City for the future where public transit systems work because of the volume of people using the systems, where energy generation and transmission is more efficient because of proximity, where Cities and towns are truly 24hr places.

The spread of housing development out of and around cities eventually creates an environment where all people use and need cars, (the larger area making a truly effective public transit system ineffective and expensive) a lack of amenity space encouraging people to retreat into their own homes on a night, this combined with the home shopping and internet revolution will not only result in urban sprawl, but would also heighten the risk to our city, as shops will no longer be cost effective, people, customers, will work at home, and will dash in and out of Leeds as quickly as they can.

In respect of a sustainable future, local space will be needed around the existing urban areas to provide scope for growing local foods near the centres of population, reducing the need for transport and creating local circular economies, where anaerobic digestion plants dispose of waste, supply local energy and nutrients to grow local food, while reducing transport miles, CO2 emissions and helping to create local and locally sustainable communities. The opportunity cost of building on green space must not be allowed to rule out this form of living in future.

It is essential for human and animal life that green space, amenity space, is available to all within easy reach of the existing urban areas.

Crash space around the Airport might be another reason for leaving these areas undeveloped, although a negative one.

I hope you can agree and consider the Government dictate to provide land for housing to be a reasonable request but one that is not allowed to diminish our already restricted green space within urban areas, leading to the loss, in future years, of those things that make life worth living and land that we might need. The concept of the greenbelt, the lungs of the city, seem more appropriate now, and perhaps more endangered now, than in any time past. Please ensure we all, human, animal, plant, have a future.

North Comments

Name: Anne Quarmby

Representor No: PRS05568 Representation ID: REP06220

Question Ref: H7

I was very concerned to hear in 2012 that large areas of land on and around Hunger Hills in Horsforth were being included in the Leeds Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA reference 1015).

I applaud the recent decision that says that this area is unsuitable for development. Hunger Hills forms one section of the narrow green corridor that links the wild areas alongside the River Aire and the Leeds Liverpool canal (via Hall Park and the 'wildflower meadow' opposite the Park) with Rawdon Billings and Otley Chevin, thereby allowing different populations of plants and animals to make contact, outbreed and maintain their vigour. As the nearby Kirkstall Forge, Clayton Wood area and former Clariant site are also all likely to be developed for housing and business use and to allow for the building of a Railway station (which can only be a good thing as it has the potential to reduce congestion and pollution on the A65) it is even more important to keep the Hunger Hills area green.

Of course there is great need to allocate land for retail, business and housing (including for people with low incomes) and that this must be done on the basis of whether it is possible for local roads and other infrastructure to support these developments. But it is also important to consider that as green spaces become fewer it becomes more important to retain the ones we still have, both for their amenity value and for the other 'services' that they provide for us.

Amenity value

As a long-term resident of West End Drive I (along with many local families, dog walkers and running club members) have had the benefit of being able to leave my home on foot and have immediate access to the fresh air and tranquillity of Hunger Hills Woods and the adjacent footpaths through the fields all the way to the boundary of Yeadon Airport. I would be very sorry if future residents of this area were not able to enjoy this privilege.

Value of natural infrastructure

Trees and plants, together with the organisms in the underlying soil, lock up significant amounts of carbon dioxide as they grow and so reduce the greenhouse effect which is believed to be contributing to climate change - with its attendant problems of drought and flooding. At the same time they release oxygen which benefits the immediate area and the nearby City. Hunger Hills woods and the surrounding fields, should be retained and regarded as part of the 'natural infrastructure' so that they can continue to provide these services even if we don't yet know how to properly put a value on them.

Additional benefits of woods and surrounding areas

Trees at different stages of growth, maturity and decay and also woodland margins, with their range of mixed grasses and wild flowers, form the best habitats for birds and insects which can have direct benefit to humans.

These include for example great tits (which can remove thousands of caterpillars from nearby fruit trees during the time it takes to raise a brood of chicks, thereby reducing the need for pesticides) and wild bees and other pollinating insects such as beetles and wasps which are very important at the present time when honey bee colonies are in severe decline. If we lose the habitats we lose the benefits.

Pollination and Bee roads

A huge range of food plants rely on pollinating insects for their survival - including carrots, onions, lettuce, beets, leeks, turnips, oil seed rape, pears, plums, strawberries raspberries and blackberries.

We need to keep the Hunger Hills woodland and the surrounding fields, with their wildflower areas, as our local contribution to supporting the work of the conservation group Buglife and the Co-Operative supermarket chain to establish 'Bee-roads' across Yorkshire (as detailed in Tony Juniper's book 'What has Nature ever done for us?').

Sustainability awareness

At this time there is an increasing awareness of the need for humans to live sustainably in our environment and to maintain the natural systems on which we rely. There are a number of different media strands currently contributing to this awareness including:

- a TV advertisement by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds showing people how to make wildlife habitats in their own gardens. The RSPB is using the slogan 'If there is no home for nature, there will be no nature'. I think we ignore this message at our peril especially when planning decisions are being made.

- the 30 part 'Shared Planet' program on Radio 4, presented by Monty Don, which 'examines the interface between human population and wildlife' including the benefits and 'services' that we get from nature

- The recent 'State of Nature' report from 25 conservation bodies in the UK which emphasizes that many species of plants and animals are in decline.

Other green spaces

Local groups are also promoting awareness of the benefits to communities as well as to wildlife, of planting edible crops. For example Roundhay Environmental Action Project (REAP) has replaced a council flower bed near Oakwood Clock with a vegetable patch. Another example is Headingley community orchard which has been planted up with apple and pear trees. These groups encourage local residents to help maintain these areas and also to harvest what they need from them.

When making future planning decisions for Leeds I would urge LCC to consider how green spaces of many different kinds, not just 'wild' ones like Hunger Hills, can be utilized for their community cohesion value. Planning for new housing and retail

North Comments

Name: Anne Quarmby

Representor No: PRS05568 **Representation ID:** REP06220

developments should include consideration of both green corridors for wildlife and shared community green space.

Sustainability in the air

As nature and sustainability are part of the zeitgeist, now would be a good time for planning authorities to explicitly re-state the value of green belt land and community green spaces and to have such areas written in to future development plans.

Leeds City Council should be considering not just Housing land availability and retention of existing wild areas but also the availability of land for new green spaces – perhaps even new woodlands.

North Comments

Name: Barrie Radcliffe

Representor No: PRS02996 **Representation ID:** REP05566

Question Ref: G17

2055 -
Retain green site.

North Comments

Name: Jane Radcliffe

Representor No: PRS02998 **Representation ID:** REP05567

Question Ref: G17

2055 -
To be retained as green space.

North Comments

Name: Elizabeth Raine

Representor No: PRS01730 Representation ID: REP03888

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Elizabeth Raine

Representor No: PRS01730 Representation ID: REP03888

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Elizabeth Raine

Representor No: PRS01730 **Representation ID:** REP03888

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Elizabeth Raine

Representor No: PRS01730 Representation ID: REP03888

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Elizabeth Raine

Representor No: PRS01730 Representation ID: REP03888

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Elizabeth Raine

Representor No: PRS01730 **Representation ID:** REP03888

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Esther Ralston

Representor No: PRS03350 Representation ID: REP00310

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Due to the number of other developments taking place in the Adel area on Brownfield sites these sites should be put back towards the very end of the plan post 2020. There are plenty of areas in Leeds with greater need for housing, and with enough facilities e.g. schools (which Adel does not), that increasing housing in Adel to this extent is a dreadful idea which will have a detrimental effect on the lives of existing residents.

Question Ref: H2

1178A is currently a green belt site. There are plenty of other areas in Leeds that can be built on before destroying green belt.

Question Ref: H3

No

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

2130. I disagree that this site should be used for housing for the following reasons: 1) Local primary schools are already over subscribed and local residents are struggling to find quality education in the local area. This will make the problem significantly worse. 2) This is one of the most attractive areas of Leeds - another housing development will change the feeling of the area and have an extremely negative effect aesthetically. 3) The roads in this area are already extremely busy during peak times with long queues on main roads and side roads. They cannot cope with any more traffic, especially as Centurion Fields etc are already going ahead. 4) The more the area is developed, the more local wildlife will be destroyed. I would suggest that this site is put back as a PAS site in the Development Plan immediately.

Question Ref: H6

No

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

I fully support the Council's designation of these sites as a red site for the following reasons: 3044 & 3360: Cookridge Hall and the golf club are major landmarks and attractions of the Adel area. They bring money to the area and create jobs for local residents. These sites are home to numerous species of flora and fauna. Having leisure facilities of this nature in the local area is crucially important to local residents and their families. Also, see reasons below. 1079, 2052, 1178B, 1243, 1246 - building on these green belt sites would have major implications for the local area: serious problems with a lack of local school places, not enough medical care, problems with roads and traffic, possible issues around flooding, destruction of the local wildlife, and the cumulative effect of destroying one of Leeds's most pleasant areas.

Question Ref: H11

1033, 1178A, 1299A - Due to the number of other developments taking place in the Adel area on Brownfield sites these sites should be put back towards the very end of the plan post 2020.

Question Ref: H12

No

North Comments

Name: Richard Ralston

Representor No: PRS04756 Representation ID: REP00354

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

1. Impact on access to both primary and secondary school places.2. Highways issues – the impact of the proposed developments on surrounding roads and traffic congestion.3. Inadequate road infrastructure to cope with the additional housing4. Significant peak hour traffic problems on surrounding roads5. The increase in local population6. Impact on the local environment7. Cumulative impact i.e. over-development of the area

Question Ref: H2

1178A - Land south of Dunstarn Lane, Adel1. Impact on access to both primary and secondary school places.2. Highways issues – the impact of the proposed developments on surrounding roads and traffic congestion.3. Inadequate road infrastructure to cope with the additional housing4. Significant peak hour traffic problems on surrounding roads5. The increase in local population6. Impact on the local environment7. Cumulative impact i.e. over-development of the area

Question Ref: H3

No

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

2130 Church Lane, Adel1. Impact on access to both primary and secondary school places.2. Highways issues – the impact of the proposed developments on surrounding roads and traffic congestion.3. Inadequate road infrastructure to cope with the additional housing4. Significant peak hour traffic problems on surrounding roads5. The increase in local population6. Impact on the local environment7. Cumulative impact i.e. over-development of the area

Question Ref: H5

n/a

Question Ref: H6

n/a

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Red site should not be developed upon due to the significant impact in the following areas:1. Impact on access to both primary and secondary school places.2. Highways issues – the impact of all the proposed developments on surrounding roads.3. Population growth – the population of Leeds is not currently growing at the rate expected.4. Inadequate road infrastructure to cope with the additional housing5. Significant peak hour traffic problems on surrounding roads6. Access to some of the sites will be dangerous and problematic7. Potential flooding/drainage issues8. The increase in local population9. Impact on the local environment10.Potential public transport issues.11.Lack of appropriate infrastructure12.Potential visual impact13.Cumulative impact i.e. over-development of the area14.Conservation area15.Ecology – e.g. wildlife, plants and natural habitat around the golf course and Paul's pond

North Comments

Name: Vivien Randerson

Representor No: PRS02223 **Representation ID:** REP04457

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The area enclosed by the railway there is already at capacity. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. The amount of traffic having to cross the railway bridge at the bottom of Tinshill Rd already a dangerous problem. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Already at full capacity will they donate a new schol and health facilites.The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree.area will obviously flood due to the lay of the land. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Richard Ranson

Representor No: PRS06052 Representation ID: REP06892

Question Ref: H7

As a resident of [x] I AGREE that this land is NOT suitable for the allocation of housing.

This is the only practical decision given the road is narrow, access to Brownberrie lane is already accident prone and the traffic on such a narrow road is already excessive.

The area is a long established 'green' area for family activities, walkers and runners, and is much cherished by the community.

[x]

North Comments

Name: Gillian Raven

Representor No: PRS04157 Representation ID: REP00851

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

local infrastructure insufficient to deal with additional housing i.e - schools, doctors, dentists, local shops etc access to the site is via one road, local roads are narrow domestic streets which are currently in a bad state of repair, they would be badly effected by heavy construction vehicles possibility of flooding to harrogate train line from surface water run off. Report from British Rail states development at Mosely wood Bottom would have adverse effect on the train line Many other Brown field sites which are available for building on which should be used before green sites Extra local traffic on domestic streets, access from Cookridge to Horsforth is via the road over the rail way, this is the only crossing point and heavily congested currently

Question Ref: H2

Moseley Wood Bottom map 15 , 1199 Disagree, reasons as set out above

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

North Comments

Name: G Rayton

Representor No: PRS02469 Representation ID: REP04735

Question Ref: H1

1199 – Moseley Bottom, Green to Red. Strongly agree Cookridge needs no more housing developments.

Strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this.

Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

North Comments

Name: B Rayton

Representor No: PRS02470 Representation ID: REP04737

Question Ref: H1

1199 – Moseley Bottom, Green to Red. Strongly agree Cookridge needs no more housing developments.

Strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this.

Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

North Comments

Name: Peter Reasbeck

Representor No: PRS01048 **Representation ID:** REP03110

Question Ref: H7

2160 & 2046 - I have been informed through our local councillor that sites 2160 and 2046, identified as Long Bob and North Ives Farm have been listed as unsuitable for development.

As a Horsforth resident [x] I send this message to indicate my agreement with the decision.

North Comments

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05770 Representation ID: REP06597

Question Ref: H1

Site 3328

The land at Layton Road (Ref: 3328) has been colour coded red, but it is maintained it should be colour coded green.

Sites which have been colour coded red are sites which are not considered suitable for allocation for housing. We do not agree with the Council's conclusions in relation to the land at Layton Lane and maintain this is a site which has the greatest potential to be allocated for housing and should be colour coded green.

It is evident from a review of the summary reasons for the colour coding of the Layton Road site, this has been colour coded red as it is considered the development of the site would result in the coalescence of Horsforth and Rawdon. We do not support this conclusion, the development of this site would still leave a wide strategic gap between the site and the nearest properties to the east of West End Lane.

When considered in conjunction with the Cold Harbour Farm site (for which separate representations have been prepared) this site would form a natural extension to the Cold Harbour Farm site at its south eastern extent.

A review of the detailed site assessment suggests the development of the site would result in the physical connection of settlements. This is not the case, there would still be an area of open land between Rawdon and Horsforth. We do agree with the Council that the site has natural / physical features which provide strong boundaries to contain development.

The site scores well in terms of the highways assessment where it is concluded the site is supported for allocation with some mitigation to ease congestion on Horsforth Ring Road to be addressed as part of a cumulative fund from developments within the vicinity.

Whilst West Yorkshire Ecology and Leeds Council's Ecology Officer do not support the development of the site, they accept there are no site based designations but they suggest the wooded beck corridor which runs down the western parts of the site comprise UK BAP Priority habitats. It is maintained the site is of a sufficient size that it can deliver some housing whilst still leaving an appropriate buffer with the wooded beck corridor. On this basis, the presence of this wooded corridor is not considered to be a development constraint as it can be protected as part of any development proposals for the site.

On the basis of the evidence set out, we object to the Council's conclusions in relation to the land at Layton Lane and maintain this is a site which has the greatest potential to be allocated. Contrary to the Council's conclusions, the site is in a wholly suitable location for residential development and issues identified by the Council can be satisfactorily mitigated and as such the site should be colour coded green.

See representation submitted for full details.

North Comments

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05770 Representation ID: REP06597

Question Ref: H4

Sites 3327 and 3330

The land at Bayton Lane / Layton Road junction (3327) and land at West End Lane (ref: 3330) have been identified as red sites and are therefore considered to be unsuitable for housing allocation. We do not agree with the Council's conclusions in relation to these sites. It is maintained they are sites which have potential to be allocated for housing but where there may be issues to resolve. On this basis, it is maintained these sites should be colour coded amber.

The Council's overall conclusion for site 3327 identifies that the site is relatively well contained on all sides by the road and existing residential development, but it is considered the site would further reduce the Green Belt gap between residential areas. We do not support the Council's conclusions in relation to this site. It is maintained the site does not currently perform a Green Belt function given it is surrounded by built development on three sides. To the north there is a large residential dwelling, to the east is the club house and car parking area for Horsforth Golf Club and there are residential dwellings along the length of the southern boundary. The development of this site would therefore result in a natural rounding off of built development in this area.

The highways assessment for site 3327 suggests the site is not suitable for allocation for residential use. However, the total highways score is comparable with sites that have been identified as being suitable for allocation. The key issue that appears to have been raised relates to employment and public transport accessibility. The site is within easy walking and cycling distance of the A65 transport corridor which has regular bus services. Layton Road, to the south of the site is also served by the 97 Bus Service between Leeds and Yeadon. The site is also well located for access to Horsforth Train Station.

Highways also suggest that an access of Bayton Lane may not be achievable. It is maintained that a suitable access can be achieved and therefore as the site is otherwise deemed to be suitable for allocation for housing, it is appropriate to identify the site as an amber site to enable a detailed access solution to be put forward.

In relation to site 3330, this lies to the west of West End Lane. The site lies adjacent to built development to the east and would therefore form an extension to the properties located to the east of West End Lane and Southway. There is also a residential dwelling to the north of this site.

The Council's Green Belt assessment identifies that natural / physical features provide a strong defensible boundary and the site provides good access to the countryside. However, it is concluded the development of this site would reduce separation between settlements. We do not support this conclusion, there would still be a strategic gap between the built development around West End Lane / Southway / Trinity College and the residential dwellings in Yeadon to the west.

The Highways Assessment suggest the site has poor public transport accessibility, but as with site 3327, the site is well located for access to the 97 bus service between Leeds and Yeadon and Horsforth train Station. It is suggested that access should be achievable but overall it is concluded the site is only suitable for partial development. It is not clear from the assessment why the Council consider the site is only suitable for partial development. It is maintained there are no highways issues which would be a development constraint to the development of the whole of the site.

West Yorkshire Ecology and Leeds Council's Ecology Officer conclude the site's allocation is supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the hedgerows and trees along the boundary.

From the Council's conclusion it appears the primary concern relates to the merging of settlements. The development of this well contained site would not result in the merging of settlements.

It is maintained the site is suitable for residential development but given that highways have raised questions over the access into the site the site should be colour coded amber along with site 3330 to allow a suitable access solution to be put forward.

See representation submitted for full details.

Question Ref: H7

Sites 3327, 3328 and 3330

We do not agree that all of the sites that have been identified as 'red' are not suitable for allocation. In relation to site 3328 it is maintained this should be colour coded green and sites 3327 and 3330 should be colour coded amber.

See representation submitted for full details.

Question Ref: H7

Sites 3327, 3328 and 3330

We disagree that the sites to the west of Bayton Lane / West End Lane should be categorised as red. The case set out in relation to why the site 3328 should be green and sites 3327 and 3330 should be amber demonstrates these are sites which are suitable for allocation of housing.

See representation submitted for full details.

Question Ref: H11

Sites 3327, 3328 and 3330

The sites to the west of Bayton Lane and West End Lane (ref: 3327, 3328 and 3330) should be developed in the short term. These sites are deliverable in the short term as they are available now, they offer a suitable location for development now and are achievable, as there is a realistic prospect that housing can be delivered within five years.

See representation submitted for full details.

North Comments

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05770 Representation ID: REP06754

Question Ref: H1

Sites 3034 and 2119

The Cold Harbour Farm site (Ref: 3034) and Canada Road site (Ref: 2119) have been colour coded red, but it is maintained they should be colour coded green.

Sites which have been colour coded red are sites which are not considered suitable for allocation for housing. We do not agree with the Council's conclusions in relation to the Cold Harbour Farm and Canada Road sites and maintain these are sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing and should be colour coded green.

It is evident from a review of the summary reasons for the colour coding of the Cold Harbour Farm site, this has been colour coded red as a result of the size of the site, which the Council consider would have a serious impact on the openness of the Green Belt and would result in a large area of urban sprawl.

A review of the more detailed individual site assessment for site 3034 identifies that West Yorkshire Ecology and the Council's Ecology Officer support the allocation of this site. Whilst the site includes a Local Nature Area (Billing Hill), a Masterplan (Appendix 2) has been prepared for the site, which protects and enhances this local nature area from development alongside an area of land surrounding it to provide a Country Park. This will be accessible to the residents of Rawdon and Yeadon and will significantly enhance open space provision in the locality.

The allocation of the Cold Harbour Farm site provides the opportunity to deliver a Country Park. The Masterplan shows there is potential to extend and integrate the established recreational uses at the south western corner of the site into a country park which stretches up the hillside and includes the woodland at Billing Hill, and incorporates an open corridor along the ridge from which views to the south can be enjoyed.

The masterplan also shows the development of the Cold Harbour Farm site provides the potential to integrate existing rights of way into a network of green corridors which become multifunctional recreational assets. The development of this site therefore would have no negative impact on the existing nature area, but would protect and enhance it.

The detailed site assessment identifies two areas where the Council appear to conclude the Cold Harbour Farm site is not suitable for allocation for housing. The site achieves a low highways score based on the Council's assessment. A detailed Transport Assessment has been undertaken by Optima Highways and Transportation Consultancy Ltd and which is based on the Masterplan for the site. Based on this Transport Assessment, we do not agree with the Council's highways assessment of the site.

The Council's highways assessment does acknowledge that 80% of the site is accessible by public transport, but the site achieves a low accessibility score as it is maintained that only 30% of the site is accessible to services. Section 4 of the Transport Assessment addresses the site's accessibility by foot, cycle and bus.

The Optima Highway's Assessment demonstrates the following:-

There are numerous nurseries located in close proximity to the site, the nearest being approximately a 10 minute walk from the centre of the site
Three Primary Schools are located within a 15 minute walk / 5-10 minute cycle from the centre of the site
Benton Park School (secondary school) is located to the west of the site and can be reached within a 10 minute walk / 5 minute cycle
To the north and west of the site a business / industrial park can be reached within a 5-10 minute walk providing a range of local employment opportunities
The central area of Rawdon which comprises a range of local shops and services is located within a 15-20 minute walk / 10 minute cycle
The town of Yeadon which includes a large supermarket, shops and local services is located within a 15-20 minute walk / 10 minute cycle
Horsforth train station can be reached by bicycle within 10-15 minutes with cycle parking being available at the station.

Figure 5 of Optima's Transport Assessment shows the pedestrian accessibility to key facilities from the centre of development parcel to the north of the proposed Country Park. Figure 6 shows the pedestrian accessibility to key facilities from the centre of the development parcel to the south west of the proposed Country Park. Figure 7 shows the cycle accessibility to key facilities from the site.

Based on the detailed transport assessment prepared by Optima Highways, it is maintained the site is wholly accessible to local services and the score in this regard should be revised, particularly given the Council's assessment of accessibility will not have been undertaken on the basis of the Masterplan for the site or in the level of detail of the assessment undertaken by Optima. Our detailed evidence demonstrates the Council's conclusions with regard to accessibility are incorrect.

In relation to access into the Cold Harbour Farm site, the Council consider that Bayton Lane is too narrow and has no footway, but accept this could be mitigated. It is suggested that access through Larkfield Road would be required through another site but that this access would not be suitable due to the brow of the hill resulting in visibility issues. It is also suggested that access to Belmont Grove is likely to be unsuitable unless significant signalisation / road improvements are completed at the A658 / B6152. Again, we do not agree with the Council's assessment of the potential access options into the site.

Section 3 of Optima Highways Transport Assessment assesses the proposed accesses into the site as shown on the Masterplan for the site. There are two principle access routes proposed, one from where the site adjoins Bayton Lane at its northern extent and a second access from Layton Road at the site's southern extent.

The Bayton Lane access is proposed through the realignment of the existing Bayton Lane so that the link road through the development forms the primary route before connecting with the traffic signals at Victoria Avenue to the west. In essence the link will take the form of a through route and therefore there will be no site access junction at the northern extent of the development. It is not proposed to close Bayton Lane as part of the development but to realign the existing carriage way at its northern end as it meets the link road which runs through the development. The reassignment process associated with the link road will reduce the number of trips using Bayton Lane and as such having this road forming the minor route that has to give way to the major route is entirely appropriate. Further details are set out in the Transport Assessment which is submitted as part of the representations relating to this site.

The Layton Road access will take the form of a standard roundabout, which has been subject to detailed capacity assessments that demonstrate the roundabout operates efficiently and well within capacity ensuring there are no additional delays to existing traffic routing along Layton Road.

North Comments

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05770 **Representation ID:** REP06754

Whilst the Council's assessment suggests access to Larkfield Road will be required through another site, the Optima Highways Assessment demonstrates that an access through to Larkfield Road is not required as a suitable access can be achieved at the site's boundary with Layton Road, which lies to the west of Larkfield Road. It is suggested the Highways Comments do not refer to a potential access option from Layton Road as a result of the south western extent of the site which fronts onto Layton Road lying within the North Leeds Housing Market Area. The Aireborough Housing Market Area Map does not provide any suggestion the site continues beyond that housing market area and it is maintained that where a site lies in more than one housing market area the whole site should be shown along with the location of the housing market area boundary, this would avoid such errors occurring in the future.

The Transport Assessment undertaken by Optima has also assessed the likely impact of the proposed development on the local highway network. Seven of the twelve junctions assessed are shown to satisfactorily accommodate the impact of the predicated development trips. Improvements will be required at the remaining junctions and will ensure the network will operate satisfactorily. On this basis, the impact on the local highway network can be fully mitigated.

The Council's highways conclusions advise there is no suitable mitigation for access onto Larkfield Road which is deemed by the Council to be essential to progress this large site and distribute trips on the network. This appears to be their main reason for not supporting the site for allocation.

Contrary to these conclusions, the Larkfield Road access is not essential as a suitable access from Layton Road can be achieved to provide access into the site from its southern extent. On this basis, we do not agree with the Council's highways conclusions and it is maintained the detailed evidence set out in the Optima Highways Transport Assessment demonstrates the site's allocation can be wholly supported in relation to accessibility, access into the site and impact on the local highway network.

The detailed assessment of the site also makes no mention of a major highways scheme the Cold Harbour Farm site can help to deliver. As detailed in Optima's Transport Assessment, the site provides a deliverable opportunity to secure a major piece of infrastructure that is an aspiration of Leeds City Council and Leeds Bradford International Airport.

Redrow are in a position to deliver a 2 kilometre (approx.) section of link road across privately owned land to assist the Council in delivering a relief road between the A65 and the airport to bypass the centre of Yeadon and improve the route to the airport from Leeds. This relief road is deemed to be necessary by the Council to deliver the economic growth in the Leeds city region through improving connectivity to the airport.

Optima's Transport Assessment sets out two options for this key link road to provide flexibility and ensure the road is fit for purpose. It is concluded the link road design is suitable for either of the two link road options i.e. it meets the requirement of a full link road but also a local distributor type road if it was just required to serve the proposed development

The allocation and delivery of this site therefore provides a major infrastructure benefit in providing a key section of the airport relief road, as well as associated economic benefits that will result from improved connectivity between the airport and the wider Leeds area. This has not been taken into account in the Council's assessment and should be given due weight.

The Masterplan also identifies an area of land towards the northern extent of the site for a park and ride. This is a further infrastructure benefit of the allocation of this site, that is not recognised in the Council's assessment.

The other concern raised in the Council's Cold Harbour Farm assessment relates to the site currently being identified as Green Belt. The Council's Green Belt assessment suggests there would be a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt and result in a large area of urban sprawl. It is also stated that the site performs an important countryside function and surrounds an important nature area.

We do not support the conclusions of the Council's Green Belt assessment. Given this is a large site, the assessment takes no account of how the site, when allocated, could be developed to minimise the impact on the openness of the adjoining Green Belt land, protect and enhance the local nature area and provide access to the countryside. As there is a large area of open land to the west of the site, the development of this site would not result in the coalescence of Rawdon / Yeadon with Horsforth which lies to the west in the North Leeds Housing Market Area.

The masterplan for the site proposes the delivery of a Country Park in the centre of the site. This has a number of key benefits which the Council has not given any consideration to. Firstly, it protects and enhances the Local Nature Area and provides additional public open space around it. Secondly, it reduces the area of the site that is to be developed. The development statement which accompanies the Masterplan for the site identifies that of the total land area of 88.7 hectares (this is to total of site refs: 3326 and 3034), open space and open common land will account for 39.7 hectares. This equates to 45% of the land parcel that would remain open.

The location of the Country Park in the centre of the site also effectively splits the site into two smaller development areas, further reducing the impact of the perceived scale of the proposed development. These two areas are then broken down into smaller development cells with green corridors in between to facilitate views in the adjoining countryside throughout the development.

The Masterplan shows the careful placement of the development cells which preserve the character of Rawdon / Yeadon and its connection with the adjoining countryside. The Masterplan creates direct and safe pedestrian and cycle routes through the site complementing the existing rights of way.

Based on the Masterplan, it is estimated the entire land parcel could deliver up to 1,530 dwellings. In contrast, the Council suggest the two sites could deliver 2,088 dwellings. It is evident that in undertaking the Green Belt assessment, the Council has given no consideration to how the site could actually be developed, based on the number of dwellings the Council suggest the sites would deliver, it is assumed the assessment is based on the entire site comprising built development.

The Masterplan shows the site as a whole can deliver up to 1,530 dwellings, along with a Country Park and an area of Common Land (which the Council identify as site ref: 3326) in a manner that is sympathetic to the Green Belt that would adjoin it. The site would deliver two parcels of housing development, one to the north of the existing residential properties off Town Street and Layton Road, to the east of Rawdon and one to the east of properties on Markham Avenue, Belmont Grove, Dorchester Drive and Moorland Avenue to the south west of Yeadon and north east of Rawdon. This results in an extension of the existing settlement in what is essentially two different, but well connected areas, one parcel relating to Yeadon and the other Rawdon.

North Comments

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05770 Representation ID: REP06754

It is therefore maintained that on the basis of the Masterplan that has been prepared for the site, the development would not have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt that would lie to the north and west of the two development parcels. With the site being split into two development parcels with the Country Park between them, this ensures the development of the land parcel does not result in a large area of urban sprawl, whilst providing access to the countryside, protecting and enhancing the Billing Hill nature area and providing other benefits to the City in the form of part of the airport relief road and a park and ride facility.

On the basis of the evidence set out, we object to the Council's conclusions in relation to the Green Belt and highways assessment for Cold Harbour Farm and maintain this is a site which has the greatest potential to be allocated. The site is in a wholly suitable location for residential development, there are no issues that would need to be resolved and as such the site should be colour coded green.

In relation to the Canada Road site, which is a UDP PAS site, the Council has concluded the site is unsuitable for allocation for housing. The detailed site assessment shows the site scores well with the exception of the highway's comments which conclude the site is located close to a brow and as such an acceptable access does not appear to be possible. The Council's conclusions are not accepted in the context of the masterplan for this and the adjoining sites.

As the Canada Road site forms part of a wider development proposal including the land at Cold Harbour Farm and land north of Bayton Lane, it is not proposed for this site to be accessed from Canada Road / Larkfield Road. The masterplan shows the Canada Road site would form an extension of the Cold Harbour Farm part of the site and therefore this part of the site will be accessed from its eastern extent from the new road network proposed as part of the Cold Harbour Farm proposals. A suitable access can therefore be achieved in conjunction with the development of the Cold Harbour Farm site. On this basis, the Canada Road site is one which has the greatest potential to be allocated and should be colour coded along with the Cold Harbour Farm site.

The Council has identified 806 units which could be delivered from sites they have classified as being 'green'. Based on the Council's calculation, sites to deliver 1,548 units will be required, although our evidence suggests this figure should be significantly higher. Even on the Council's evidence, the capacity from green sites is only 806 dwellings and therefore 742 dwellings will need to be delivered from other sites in any event. However, it is maintained there is detailed evidence the Cold Harbour Farm and Canada Road sites are suitable for housing and do not have any potential issues to resolve and therefore these sites will increase the number of 'green' sites in the Aireborough area and contribute towards meeting the housing requirement in this area.

See representation submitted for full details

Question Ref: H4

Site 3326

The land to the north of Bayton Lane, Rawdon (Site Ref: 3326) forms part of the wider land parcel at Cold Harbour Farm, which lies to the south of Bayton Lane. It is maintained the site should be considered as part of the Cold Harbour Farm site, but as a result of the presence of a Site of Ecological or Geological Interest (SEGI), this site is less suitable for comprehensive development than the land to the south of Bayton Lane. The site could deliver some dwellings to connect the development of the Cold Harbour Farm site with existing dwellings and built development to the north of Bayton Lane and east of Victoria Avenue (A658). This site should be identified for allocation alongside the Cold Harbour Farm site.

The Masterplan for the whole land parcel identifies site 3326 as an area of Common Land with no development proposed. At the very least the site should be incorporated into the Cold Harbour Farm site to support the delivery of this area of open space as part of the wider development. However, it is maintained the site could sustain some development, which would form a natural extension to the built development to the west and the development proposed as part of the Cold Harbour farm site.

In the context of the site containing a SEGI, it is considered appropriate to colour code this site amber, as it is a site which has potential, but where there may be issues to resolve.

See also representation submitted for full details

Question Ref: H4

Some of the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for future housing development as they are sites with issues which the Council does not have sufficient information to determine whether they can be resolved.

However, there are amber sites where an issue, such as in the case of the land to the east of Rawdon where the Council suggest there may be access issues but there is a proven solution and as such the Council has sufficient evidence to know that issues they have identified can be fully resolved or mitigated to an acceptable degree. On this basis, it is considered that sites should not be identified as amber solely because the Council has identified potential development constraints. Due consideration should be given the ease of mitigating or resolving the issue/s identified.

See representation submitted for full details

Question Ref: H7

Sites 2119, 3034 and 3326

We disagree that the Bayton lane sites (Refs: 3034, 2119 and 3326) should be categorised as red. The case set out in relation to why the main Cold Harbour Farm and Canada Road sites should be green and the smaller site to the north of Bayton Lane amber, clearly demonstrates these are sites which are suitable for allocation of housing.

See also representation submitted for full details

North Comments

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05770 Representation ID: REP06754

Question Ref: H7

Sites 2119, 3034 and 3326

We do not agree that all of the sites that have been identified as 'red' are not suitable for allocation. In relation to the Bayton Lane site which has been colour coded red, it is maintained the Cold Harbour Farm site should be colour coded green and the land to the north of Bayton Lane should be colour coded amber.

See also representation submitted for full details

Question Ref: H11

Sites 3034 and 3326

The Bayton Lane sites (refs: 3034 and 3326) should be developed in the short term. The sites are deliverable in the short term as they are available now, they offer a suitable location for development now and are achievable, as there is a realistic prospect that housing can be delivered within five years.

See also representation submitted for full details

North Comments

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05770 Representation ID: REP07897

Question Ref: H7

Canada Road, Rawdon (Site Ref: 2119) Disagree should be green - see submitted representation for full details

5.9 The Canada Road site (ref: 2119) has been identified as a red site, and therefore the Council consider it is a site which is not considered to be suitable for allocation for housing.

5.10 In relation to the Canada Road site, the summary table of the sites assessed for potential housing allocations in the Aireborough area advises:-

"This is a Protected Area of Search (PAS) site in the existing UDP. Whilst the site is considered to be well related to the urban area, Highways object to development of the site due to poor visibility of the site access."

5.11 We object to this site being identified as a red site, the site is one which has the greatest potential to be allocated and should be identified as a green site.

Question Ref: H7

Cold Harbour Farm, Bayton Lane, Yeadon (Site Ref: 3034) Disagree should be green See submitted representation for full details

5.3 The Cold Harbour Farm site (site ref: 3034) has been identified as a red site, and therefore the Council consider it is a site which is not considered to be suitable for allocation for housing.

5.4 In relation to the Cold Harbour Farm site, the summary table of the sites assessed for potential housing allocations in the Aireborough area advises:-

"Green Belt site. The site covers the area commonly known as Rawdon billings and envelopes Billing Hill, a protected nature area. The site is large and development would have a serious impact on the openness of the Green Belt and result in a large area of urban sprawl. The area and capacity of has been split — 2.66 ha capacity of 70 in North Leeds housing market characteristic area, majority (56.25ha) in Aireborough."

5.5 We object to this site being identified as a red site, the site is one which has the greatest potential to be allocated and should be identified as a green site.

Question Ref: H7

Land north of Bayton Lane, Rawdon (Site Ref: 3326) Disagree should be green See submitted representation for full details

5.6 The land to the north of Bayton Lane (site ref: 3326) lies to the north of the Cold Harbour Farm site. The site has been colour coded red and therefore the Council consider it to be a site which is not suitable for allocation for housing.

5.7 In relation to the north of Bayton Lane site, the summary table of the sites assessed for potential housing allocations in the Aireborough area states:-

"Green Belt site. The site contains a Site of Ecological or Geological Interest (SEGI) and is not considered suitable for development. The area not covered

Question Ref: H7

Site 3326 - see submitted representation for full details

The land to the north of Bayton Lane, Rawdon (Site Ref: 3326) forms part of the wider land parcel at Cold Harbour Farm, which lies to the south of Bayton Lane. It is maintained the site should be considered as part of the Cold Harbour Farm site, but as a result of the presence of a Site of Ecological or Geological Interest (SEGI), this site is less suitable for comprehensive development than the land to the south of Bayton Lane. The site could deliver some dwellings to connect the development of the Cold Harbour Farm site with existing dwellings and built development to the north of Bayton Lane and east of Victoria Avenue (A658). This site should be identified for allocation alongside the Cold Harbour Farm site.

5.51 The Masterplan for the whole land parcel identifies site 3326 as an area of Common Land with no development proposed. At the very least the site should be incorporated into the Cold Harbour Farm site to support the delivery of this area of open space as part of the wider development.

However, it is maintained the site could sustain some development, which would form a natural extension to the built development to the west and the development proposed as part of the Cold Harbour farm site.

5.52 In the context of the site containing a SEGI, it is considered appropriate to colour code this site amber, as it is a site which has potential, but where there may be issues to resolve.

North Comments

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05772 Representation ID: REP07319

Question Ref: H7

1310 Outwood Lane, Horsforth

We disagree with the identification of site 1310 as 'red' and consider that it is wholly suitable for a housing allocation.

We do not consider that the land should be retained as an opportunity for possible future greenspace and it should be released for housing. The proposed development of this site for 34 dwellings will result in the provision of additional, useable open space with links to adjacent open space which will be a direct improvement to the existing situation, whereby only a public footpath "Conker Alley" is useable, with the remainder of the site being in private ownership. The open space and wildlife corridor through the site will be retained and enhanced as a result of these residential proposals. In early pre consultations with planning officers in March 2012, the policy officer clearly indicated that they were not opposed to the principle of residential development on this site subject to the provision of a satisfactory amount of public open space. A subsequent formal consultation response on the application re-iterated this position. This site has been in the aspirational greenspace category for at least 25 years and the Council have not sought to acquire the land. Current UDP Policy N5 recognises that other agencies can bring such sites forward and this is often achieved in association with partial development.

The Council's reasoning for the 'Red' rating of this site is:

"Part of the site is designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP, linking to greenspace to the north west, north east and south of the site. A planning application for residential development was previously refused due to loss of greenspace, conservation reasons, and access issues. Highway concerns regarding access as the site has no road frontage and accessibility."

Firstly, the latter part of this summary is incorrect, as the site does have a road frontage directly onto Outwood Lane, where a suitable access is achievable.

An Inquiry into the refusal of a planning application for 34 dwellings will commence on the 17th September 2013. The application proposes 34 dwellings, which is substantially less than the Council's identified site capacity of 121 dwellings. The proposal incorporates large areas of open space and landscaping with appropriate links to adjacent areas of open space (see the attached site layout plan which differentiates areas of development and different areas of open space within the site boundary). Indeed the submission site is located within a proposed linking corridor on the LDF Core Strategy Strategic Green Infrastructure Plan (see Green Infrastructure plan appended to this response). The site specific proposals will contribute to the realisation of the identified corridor connection between the Kirkstall Valley to the west and Meanwood Valley to the east. The site is in a sustainable location, within walking and cycling distance to transport links and retail areas within Horsforth Town Street and New Road Side centres (See accessibility plan attached).

[Representation sets out Core Strategy policies]. Core Strategy Spatial Policy 7 Distribution of Housing Land and Allocations sets out the housing distribution by settlement hierarchy. For the Main Urban Area this is 30,000 dwellings (45%) as infill and 3,300 dwellings (55) as extensions. The housing distribution by housing market characteristic area for North Leeds is 6,000 which is 9% of the total housing requirement for the Leeds district. The North Leeds housing market is restricted to a large part of the Main Urban Area. Those sites located closest to the existing services and facilities in these settlements and which are free from substantial constraints should be preferred as allocations to meet this housing requirement, where, as in this case, sites can deliver environmental and other benefits they should be in the first rank for selection as allocations.

The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the

Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47). The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and a national housebuilder and the progression of a

planning application. The site is in a very sustainable location, and suitable for the delivery of housing as detailed in this response. There are no insurmountable physical problems or limitations and as such the site is considered to be suitable for housing. It is considered that this is an achievable site, which has a realistic prospect of being delivered in the short term. There are no known viability issues restricting the site from coming forward.

Question Ref: H11

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

Question Ref: General comment

Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.

North Comments

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05772 Representation ID: REP07325

Question Ref: G15

1310 Outwood Lane, Horsforth

We disagree with the identification of site 1310 as 'red' and consider that it is wholly suitable for a housing allocation.

We do not consider that the land should be retained as an opportunity for possible future greenspace and it should be released for housing. The proposed development of this site for 34 dwellings will result in the provision of additional, useable open space with links to adjacent open space which will be a direct improvement to the existing situation, whereby only a public footpath "Conker Alley" is useable, with the remainder of the site being in private ownership. The open space and wildlife corridor through the site will be retained and enhanced as a result of these residential proposals. In early pre consultations with planning officers in March 2012, the policy officer clearly indicated that they were not opposed to the principle of residential development on this site subject to the provision of a satisfactory amount of public open space. A subsequent formal consultation response on the application re-iterated this position. This site has been in the aspirational greenspace category for at least 25 years and the Council have not sought to acquire the land. Current UDP Policy N5 recognises that other agencies can bring such sites forward and this is often achieved in association with partial development.

The Council's reasoning for the 'Red' rating of this site is:

"Part of the site is designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP, linking to greenspace to the north west, north east and south of the site. A planning application for residential development was previously refused due to loss of greenspace, conservation reasons, and access issues. Highway concerns regarding access as the site has no road frontage and accessibility."

Firstly, the latter part of this summary is incorrect, as the site does have a road frontage directly onto Outwood Lane, where a suitable access is achievable.

An Inquiry into the refusal of a planning application for 34 dwellings will commence on the 17th September 2013. The application proposes 34 dwellings, which is substantially less than the Council's identified site capacity of 121 dwellings. The proposal incorporates large areas of open space and landscaping with appropriate links to adjacent areas of open space (see the attached site layout plan which differentiates areas of development and different areas of open space within the site boundary). Indeed the submission site is located within a proposed linking corridor on the LDF Core Strategy Strategic Green Infrastructure Plan (see Green Infrastructure plan appended to this response). The site specific proposals will contribute to the realisation of the identified corridor connection between the Kirkstall Valley to the west and Meanwood Valley to the east. The site is in a sustainable location, within walking and cycling distance to transport links and retail areas within Horsforth Town Street and New Road Side centres (See accessibility plan attached).

[Representation sets out Core Strategy policies]. Core Strategy Spatial Policy 7 Distribution of Housing Land and Allocations sets out the housing distribution by settlement hierarchy. For the Main Urban Area this is 30,000 dwellings (45%) as infill and 3,300 dwellings (55) as extensions. The housing distribution by housing market characteristic area for North Leeds is 6,000 which is 9% of the total housing requirement for the Leeds district. The North Leeds housing market is restricted to a large part of the Main Urban Area. Those sites located closest to the existing services and facilities in these settlements and which are free from substantial constraints should be preferred as allocations to meet this housing requirement, where, as in this case, sites can deliver environmental and other benefits they should be in the first rank for selection as allocations.

The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the

Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47). The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and a national housebuilder and the progression of a

planning application. The site is in a very sustainable location, and suitable for the delivery of housing as detailed in this response. There are no insurmountable physical problems or

limitations and as such the site is considered to be suitable for housing. It is considered that this is an achievable site, which has a realistic prospect of being delivered in the short term. There are no known viability issues restricting the site from coming forward.

North Comments

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05772 Representation ID: REP07440

Question Ref: H7

Site 1310

Housing

Volume 2: 5 North

H7. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'red' are not suitable for allocation for future housing development?

We disagree with the identification of site 1310 as 'red' and consider that it is wholly suitable for a housing allocation.

G15. The existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) designation of land at Outwood Lane, Horsforth has been put forward as a possible housing site (site ref 1310). It was not identified as in a greenspace use in the Open Space Audit and has clearly not been delivered through Policy N5, therefore it is proposed to delete the allocation. Do you think this land should be retained as an opportunity for possible future greenspace or could it be released for housing?

In answer to question G15, we do not consider that the land should be retained as an opportunity for possible future greenspace and it should be released for housing. The proposed development of this site for 34 dwellings will result in the provision of additional, useable open space with links to adjacent open space which will be a direct improvement to the existing situation, whereby only a public footpath "Conker Alley" is useable, with the remainder of the site being in private ownership. The open space and wildlife corridor through the site will be retained and enhanced as a result of these residential proposals. In early pre consultations with planning officers in March 2012, the policy officer clearly Leeds Site Allocations Plan – Issues and Options July 2013

On behalf of Redrow Homes

Site reference 1310 – Land at Outwood Lane, Horsforth

indicated that they were not opposed to the principle of residential development on this site subject to the provision of a satisfactory amount of public open space. A subsequent formal consultation response on the application re-iterated this position.

This site has been in the aspirational greenspace category for at least 25 years and the Council have not sought to acquire the land. Current UDP Policy N5 recognises that other agencies can bring such sites forward and this is often achieved in association with partial development.

The Council's reasoning for the 'Red' rating of this site is:

"Part of the site is designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP, linking to greenspace to the north west, north east and south of the site. A planning application for residential development was previously refused due to loss of greenspace, conservation reasons, and access issues. Highway concerns regarding access as the site has no road frontage and accessibility."

Firstly, the latter part of this summary is incorrect, as the site does have a road frontage directly onto Outwood Lane, where a suitable access is achievable.

An Inquiry into the refusal of a planning application for 34 dwellings will commence on the 17th September 2013. The application proposes 34 dwellings, which is substantially less than the Council's identified site capacity of 121 dwellings. The proposal incorporates large areas of open space and landscaping with appropriate links to adjacent areas of open space (see the attached site layout plan which differentiates areas of development and different areas of open space within the site boundary). Indeed the submission site is located within a proposed linking corridor on the LDF Core Strategy Strategic Green Infrastructure Plan (see Green Infrastructure plan appended to this response). The site specific proposals will contribute to the realisation of the identified corridor connection between the Kirkstall Valley to the west and Meanwood Valley to the east.

The site is in a sustainable location, within walking and cycling distance to transport links and retail areas within Horsforth Town Street and New Road Side centres (See accessibility plan attached).

Leeds Site Allocations Plan – Issues and Options July 2013

On behalf of Redrow Homes

Site reference 1310 – Land at Outwood Lane, Horsforth

Policy

Core Strategy Spatial Policy 1 sets out that to deliver the spatial strategy the broad spatial framework for the location and scale of development is to concentrate the majority of new development within urban areas taking advantage of existing services, high levels of accessibility and priorities for urban regeneration and an appropriate balance of brownfield and greenfield land. Smaller settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlements size, function and sustainability.

Core Strategy Spatial Policy 6 sets out that the allocation of housing land is based on criteria such as sustainable locations, the least impact on Green Belt purposes and avoiding areas of flood risk. The development of this site accords with this draft policy.

Core Strategy Spatial Policy 7 Distribution of Housing Land and Allocations sets out the housing distribution by settlement hierarchy. For the Main Urban Area this is 30,000 dwellings (45%) as infill and 3,300 dwellings (55) as extensions. The housing distribution by housing market characteristic area for North Leeds is 6,000 which is 9% of the total housing requirement for the Leeds district. The North Leeds housing market is restricted to a large

North Comments

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05772 Representation ID: REP07440

part of the Main Urban Area. Those sites located closest to the existing services and facilities in these settlements and which are free from substantial constraints should be preferred as allocations to meet this housing requirement, where, as in this case, sites can deliver environmental and other benefits they should be in the first rank for selection as allocations.

Conclusions

The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47). The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and a national housebuilder and the progression of a planning application. The site is in a very sustainable location, and suitable for the delivery of housing as detailed in this response. There are no insurmountable physical problems or limitations and as such the site is considered to be suitable for housing. It is considered that this is an achievable site, which has a realistic prospect of being delivered in the short term. There are no known viability issues restricting the site from coming forward.

North Comments

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05772 Representation ID: REP07442

Question Ref: G15

Site1310

G15. The existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) designation of land at Outwood Lane, Horsforth has been put forward as a possible housing site (site ref 1310). It was not identified as in a greenspace use in the Open Space Audit and has clearly not been delivered through Policy N5, therefore it is proposed to delete the allocation. Do you think this land should be retained as an opportunity for possible future greenspace or could it be released for housing?

In answer to question G15, we do not consider that the land should be retained as an opportunity for possible future greenspace and it should be released for housing. The proposed development of this site for 34 dwellings will result in the provision of additional, useable open space with links to adjacent open space which will be a direct improvement to the existing situation, whereby only a public footpath "Conker Alley" is useable, with the remainder of the site being in private ownership. The open space and wildlife corridor through the site will be retained and enhanced as a result of these residential proposals. In early pre consultations with planning officers in March 2012, the policy officer clearly Leeds Site Allocations Plan – Issues and Options July 2013

On behalf of Redrow Homes

Site reference 1310 – Land at Outwood Lane, Horsforth indicated that they were not opposed to the principle of residential development on this site subject to the provision of a satisfactory amount of public open space. A subsequent formal consultation response on the application re-iterated this position.

This site has been in the aspirational greenspace category for at least 25 years and the Council have not sought to acquire the land. Current UDP Policy N5 recognises that other agencies can bring such sites forward and this is often achieved in association with partial development.

The Council's reasoning for the 'Red' rating of this site is:

"Part of the site is designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP, linking to greenspace to the north west, north east and south of the site. A planning application for residential development was previously refused due to loss of greenspace, conservation reasons, and access issues. Highway concerns regarding access as the site has no road frontage and accessibility."

Firstly, the latter part of this summary is incorrect, as the site does have a road frontage directly onto Outwood Lane, where a suitable access is achievable.

An Inquiry into the refusal of a planning application for 34 dwellings will commence on the 17th September 2013. The application proposes 34 dwellings, which is substantially less than the Council's identified site capacity of 121 dwellings. The proposal incorporates large areas of open space and landscaping with appropriate links to adjacent areas of open space (see the attached site layout plan which differentiates areas of development and different areas of open space within the site boundary). Indeed the submission site is located within a proposed linking corridor on the LDF Core Strategy Strategic Green Infrastructure Plan (see Green Infrastructure plan appended to this response). The site specific proposals will contribute to the realisation of the identified corridor connection between the Kirkstall Valley to the west and Meanwood Valley to the east.

The site is in a sustainable location, within walking and cycling distance to transport links and retail areas within Horsforth Town Street and New Road Side centres (See accessibility plan attached).

Leeds Site Allocations Plan – Issues and Options July 2013

On behalf of Redrow Homes

Site reference 1310 – Land at Outwood Lane, Horsforth
Policy

Core Strategy Spatial Policy 1 sets out that to deliver the spatial strategy the broad spatial framework for the location and scale of development is to concentrate the majority of new development within urban areas taking advantage of existing services, high levels of accessibility and priorities for urban regeneration and an appropriate balance of brownfield and greenfield land. Smaller settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlements size, function and sustainability.

Core Strategy Spatial Policy 6 sets out that the allocation of housing land is based on criteria such as sustainable locations, the least impact on Green Belt purposes and avoiding areas of flood risk. The development of this site accords with this draft policy.

Core Strategy Spatial Policy 7 Distribution of Housing Land and Allocations sets out the housing distribution by settlement hierarchy. For the Main Urban Area this is 30,000 dwellings (45%) as infill and 3,300 dwellings (55) as extensions. The housing distribution by housing market characteristic area for North Leeds is 6,000 which is 9% of the total housing requirement for the Leeds district. The North Leeds housing market is restricted to a large part of the Main Urban Area. Those sites located closest to the existing services and facilities in these settlements and which are free from substantial constraints should be preferred as allocations to meet this housing requirement, where, as in this case, sites can deliver environmental and other benefits they should be in the first rank for selection as allocations.

Conclusions

The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47). The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and a national housebuilder and the progression of a planning application. The site is in a very sustainable location, and suitable for the delivery of

North Comments

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05772 **Representation ID:** REP07442

housing as detailed in this response. There are no insurmountable physical problems or limitations and as such the site is considered to be suitable for housing. It is considered that this is an achievable site, which has a realistic prospect of being delivered in the short term. There are no known viability issues restricting the site from coming forward.

North Comments

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05772 Representation ID: REP07546

Question Ref: H7

Disagree site should be green - see submitted representation for full details.

The sites to the west of Bayton Lane and West End Lane have been demonstrated to be suitable, available, achievable and developable for residential development and as such, the allocation of these sites for housing should be supported.

7.2 We object to the identification of site 3328 as a 'red' site. The evidence set out in this statement identifies the site is suitable for residential development and there are no development constraints that cannot be appropriately mitigated. The site would also form a natural extension to the Cold Harbour Farm site to the north of Layton Road, which is also being promoted for development by Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd. On this basis, it is a site which has the greatest potential to be allocated and should be colour coded green.

7.3 We object to sites 3327 and 3330 being identified as red sites. We do not support the Council's conclusions with regard to these sites which raise issues relating to highways, ecology and the coalescence of settlements. It is maintained there are solutions that can be identified to mitigate against the highways and ecology issues raised and the development of these sites would not result in the coalescence of settlements. On this basis the sites are deemed to have potential for residential development and therefore they should be colour coded green.

North Comments

Name: Neil Reed

Representor No: PRS00056 Representation ID: REP00462

Question Ref: H4

1095B / 1369 - I believe these sites are unsuitable for housing for several reasons including:- the number of houses is disproportionate for the size of the village- lack of local community and retail facilities- the roads are already overcrowded and a bottleneck at peak travel periods. - Site 1095B is green belt and should remain as such.- Site 1095 is frequently subject to standing water- The road is narrow and additional traffic increases risk to pedestrians.

Question Ref: H7

2051A / 2054 - I believe these sites have been misclassified and ought to be amber or green. They are immediately adjacent to existing extensive housing and naturally boundaed by Eccup resevoir and the A61 creating natural boundaries. There is also a great number of local facilities including shops and schools. The road network would be able to sustain this size of development.

North Comments

Name: Simon Reed

Representor No: PRS00868 Representation ID: REP02887

Question Ref: H1

1199 - No - See the next question for the main reasons.

Question Ref: H2

1199 - Comments

- A housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic.
- We do not have the infrastructure to cope with the extra traffic.
- Moseley Wood Gardens has a concrete base. A cosmetic layer of tarmac is periodically applied. Extra traffic will have an impact. Streets will require constant attention. Heavy plant used during site construction will create further damage to the concrete base.
- Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times. That situation will worsen substantially with the new development.
- Commuters from Harrogate, Otley and outlying areas use Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route. Additional local traffic from a new estate will add to the problems.
- The development will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. Traffic from a new development will add substantially to the winter chaos. Roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Cookridge in winter months.
- The area will attract less people with the increased difficulties in navigating to and from Cookridge.
- The development will impact on the local schools. School places will become an issue.
- Parking is problematic and dangerous outside of the local school, Tesco and Post Office. Road safety is of prime concern. The problems will worsen with a new development. Residents are severely affected by the current situation.
- The train service is questionable. A minimum number of carriages are provided at peak times. Parking at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate for local people. Commuters travel by car from outside Leeds, park their cars on the streets around the station, and use the local train. Extra housing will compound the problems.
- There is concern over the inadequacy of the current public transport system in the area and there is poor connectivity to a number of locations in the city. As a result of this issue and a number of others this development would neither be environmentally or socially sustainable.
- Flooding may become a problem to the railway line from surface run off, causing delays.
- The countryside adjacent to Cookridge will be destroyed along with the ecology.

North Comments

Name: Keeley Reed

Representor No: PRS00869 **Representation ID:** REP02888

Question Ref: H1

1199 - No - See the next question for the main reasons.

Question Ref: H2

1199 - Comments

- A housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic.
- We do not have the infrastructure to cope with the extra traffic.
- Moseley Wood Gardens has a concrete base. A cosmetic layer of tarmac is periodically applied. Extra traffic will have an impact. Streets will require constant attention. Heavy plant used during site construction will create further damage to the concrete base.
- Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times. That situation will worsen substantially with the new development.
- Commuters from Harrogate, Otley and outlying areas use Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route. Additional local traffic from a new estate will add to the problems.
- The development will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. Traffic from a new development will add substantially to the winter chaos. Roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Cookridge in winter months.
- The area will attract less people with the increased difficulties in navigating to and from Cookridge.
- The development will impact on the local schools. School places will become an issue.
- Parking is problematic and dangerous outside of the local school, Tesco and Post Office. Road safety is of prime concern. The problems will worsen with a new development. Residents are severely affected by the current situation.
- The train service is questionable. A minimum number of carriages are provided at peak times. Parking at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate for local people. Commuters travel by car from outside Leeds, park their cars on the streets around the station, and use the local train. Extra housing will compound the problems.
- There is concern over the inadequacy of the current public transport system in the area and there is poor connectivity to a number of locations in the city. As a result of this issue and a number of others this development would neither be environmentally or socially sustainable.
- Flooding may become a problem to the railway line from surface run off, causing delays.
- The countryside adjacent to Cookridge will be destroyed along with the ecology.

North Comments

Name: Barney Reed

Representor No: PRS06964 **Representation ID:** REP04145

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Already fill to capacity with regards to facilities and infrastructure. There are other more site in North Leeds and empty houses. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Commuter traffic into Leeds City Centre is already enough to cause delays. Traffic around the school and Tesco's is hazardous enough already. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Schools are overstretched already without the addition of hundreds of new residents. Doctors are full and waiting for NHS dentists. We cannot cope with new residents but no new facilities. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Flooding has already caused delays to the train service, causes problems for commuters and network rail. Also there is evidence of flooding at the proposed access site to the site which further indicates this not a suitable. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. The proposed building site is an area of great biodiversity and British wildlife, building on it would destroy an ecosystem, something the government is actually trying to prevent.

North Comments

Name: Susan Reeve

Representor No: PRS01059 Representation ID: REP03124

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Malcolm Reeve

Representor No: PRS02162 **Representation ID:** REP04387

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree.
Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: P Reffin

Representor No: PRS01959 Representation ID: REP06834

Question Ref: H1

GREEN TO RED

Strongly agree Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Schools full/area prone to flooding/ Roads in poor state/ More Traffic in area/ Transport?

Strongly agree increase in local traffic will be a problem. More side street parking by rail users. Damage to poor state roads by more traffic.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this. Agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

North Comments

Name: P Reffin

Representor No: PRS01959 **Representation ID:** REP07747

Question Ref: H1

Site 1199

The schools are full and oversubscribed. Hard to get a doctor's appointment now. Will cause more flooding to railway line. Cookridge needs no more housing developments.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Tinshill Road and Green Lane are very busy now.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Primary schools are over subscribed.

The area, including Moseley beck, is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. The railway line gets flooded now. It will cause disruption to rail travellers.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. I go blackberrying every year. Grandchildren love going there.

North Comments

Name: Mary Reid

Representor No: PRS01828 **Representation ID:** REP03999

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Mary Reid

Representor No: PRS01828 Representation ID: REP03999

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Mary Reid

Representor No: PRS01828 Representation ID: REP03999

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Mary Reid

Representor No: PRS01828 **Representation ID:** REP03999

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Mary Reid

Representor No: PRS01828 Representation ID: REP03999

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Mary Reid

Representor No: PRS01828 Representation ID: REP03999

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: Mary Reid

Representor No: PRS01828 **Representation ID:** REP03999

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: John Reiner

Representor No: PRS01668 Representation ID: REP03818

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: John Reiner

Representor No: PRS01668 Representation ID: REP03818

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: John Reiner

Representor No: PRS01668 Representation ID: REP03818

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: John Reiner

Representor No: PRS01668 **Representation ID:** REP03818

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: John Reiner

Representor No: PRS01668 Representation ID: REP03818

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: John Reiner

Representor No: PRS01668 Representation ID: REP03818

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: John Reiner

Representor No: PRS01668 **Representation ID:** REP03818

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: David Reiner

Representor No: PRS01678 **Representation ID:** REP03826

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: David Reiner

Representor No: PRS01678 Representation ID: REP03826

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: David Reiner

Representor No: PRS01678 Representation ID: REP03826

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: David Reiner

Representor No: PRS01678 **Representation ID:** REP03826

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: David Reiner

Representor No: PRS01678 Representation ID: REP03826

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: David Reiner

Representor No: PRS01678 Representation ID: REP03826

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: David Reiner

Representor No: PRS01678 **Representation ID:** REP03826

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Residents Of Long Causeway, Adel, Leeds

Representor No: PRS05008 **Representation ID:** REP01148

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

N/A

Question Ref: H2

N/A

Question Ref: H3

N/A

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

N/A

Question Ref: H5

N/A

Question Ref: H6

N/A

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

See submitted statement in respect of sites ref. 1079, 1243 and 1246

Question Ref: H8

N/A

Question Ref: H9

N/A

Question Ref: H10

N/A

Question Ref: H11

N/A

Question Ref: H12

N/A

Question Ref: H13

N/A

Question Ref: H14

N/A

Question Ref: H15

N/A

North Comments

Name: Charlotte Revans

Representor No: PRS01599 Representation ID: REP03750

Question Ref: H1

1178A -

I would like to object to the Council's designation of the above site which you have colour coded green as it is a green belt site and I feel it should be kept as a green belt site as it is part of the Meanwood Valley Corridor. It is also home to a large variety of wildlife.

I feel that existing brown sites should be considered for use before taking green belt land.

(1) Adel does not have a suitable road infrastructure to cope with additional housing. At peak times Dunstarn Drive and Dunstarn Lane would become a race track as cars who could not get out of the proposed site entrance onto Long Causeway would then use Dunstarn Drive instead. The increase in cars of about 120 approximately from the above proposed site would add to the traffic problems on surrounding roads particularly at peak times.

(2) Existing schools are full in this area and are not big enough to take any more children.

(3) Existing Doctors surgery on Long Causeway would be unable to cope with any more patients, and even now appointments can be difficult to make.

(4) Public transport would not be able to cope with a large increase in local population

(5) Leeds population is not currently growing at the rate expected so why build houses that are not required?

(6) The only shop in this part of Adel is a small store on Sir George Martin Drive which due to its size only holds a small stock of produce.

(7) Local job prospects, where will people find jobs as there are very few now.

(8) Since living here I have noticed after heavy rain and snow the field becomes waterlogged and flooded areas of water take a long time to drain away, this has been particularly noticed this spring.

(9) Any new build on land south of Dunstarn Lane would not be on any building line, and would also be over developing the area.

(10) Existing Dunstarn properties are all individually designed and built, no two houses are the same so appearance wise any future development would need to follow suit, and potentially very costly to any builder.

(11) I am very concerned about the access issues for any proposed building on the above site.

(12) Any new build would have a drastic impact as it seems they are built so close together as at Centurian Fields site.

There are already houses being built in this area at Centirion Field site and a couple of future proposed developments on the Bodington Hall site and the Government Buildings site, surely these should be adequate for the new properties required for this area.

Question Ref: H4

2130 -

This was a Protected Area of Search site and has been changed to colour code amber I feel this should be reverted back to Protected Area of Search due to its heritage and historical value.

North Comments

Name: Diana Reynolds

Representor No: PRS01732 **Representation ID:** REP03890

Question Ref: H1

- 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Diana Reynolds

Representor No: PRS01732 Representation ID: REP03890

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Diana Reynolds

Representor No: PRS01732 Representation ID: REP03890

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Diana Reynolds

Representor No: PRS01732 **Representation ID:** REP03890

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Diana Reynolds

Representor No: PRS01732 Representation ID: REP03890

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Diana Reynolds

Representor No: PRS01732 Representation ID: REP03890

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Diana Reynolds

Representor No: PRS01732 **Representation ID:** REP03890

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Keith Reynolds

Representor No: PRS02624 Representation ID: REP04928

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Keith Reynolds

Representor No: PRS02624 Representation ID: REP04928

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Keith Reynolds

Representor No: PRS02624 **Representation ID:** REP04928

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Keith Reynolds

Representor No: PRS02624 Representation ID: REP04928

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Keith Reynolds

Representor No: PRS02624 Representation ID: REP04928

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Keith Reynolds

Representor No: PRS02624 **Representation ID:** REP04928

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Rhodes Asset Management Ltd

Representor No: PRS06441 Representation ID: REP07515

Question Ref: H4

4021

[sets out details of 4021 as in the Site Allocations Plan and the site assessment.]
[see representation for site plan]

My clients have recently purchased the site which has now been vacant following its previous employment based use, for some time. As part of this acquisition process considerable due diligence work has been undertaken. The site is situated within the urban area and apart from the principal mill building, has little to offer in its existing state to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area within which the site is located. In addition the site is situated within a predominantly residential area in a highly sustainable location. The purpose of this representation submission is to provide further more detailed information on the issues identified within the earlier site assessment process for the site undertaken by the City Council, so that the status of the site in relation to availability, suitability and achievability can be elevated from its current amber colouration to one of green colouration as the plan process moves forward. My clients have recently appointed a full design team to commence preparatory work on a detailed scheme for the redevelopment of the site for residential use. As part of this work detailed assessments have been undertaken in relation to the key aspects of highways, flood risk and ecology. In addition an initial layout has been prepared on the basis of the findings to date and a copy of this is enclosed with this representation. My clients will shortly be engaging with the City Council Development Control Officers as part of the formal pre-application discussions to progress towards an early application submission based upon this envisaged residential redevelopment scheme.

It is therefore the intention to supplement this representation in due course with further more definitive statements on these key aspects as well as Officer and consultation response feedback to provide even more certainty on the short term opportunity for residential development on the site.

Site Allocations Plan suggested revisions

Within the context of the current Site Allocations Plan content as it relates to the Horsforth

Mills site, my clients would request consideration of the following amendments to the Site

Allocations Plan to recognise the appropriate potential of the site to provide an element of the housing land supply for the north area of the district.

1 Highway aspects

An initial assessment of the existing access arrangements to the site including acknowledgement of the sites previous use and activity, as well as the surrounding highway infrastructure, suggests a residential redevelopment of the site can deliver an improvement in relation to highway and access considerations with a proposed "in only" from the Low Lane / Butcher Hill roundabout and an "out only" arrangement connecting to the adopted highway at Cornmill View adjacent to the northern boundary of the site.

This is currently based upon a scheme incorporating a total of 96 dwellings contained within a conversion of the main mill building and some associated new build within the remaining available site area. Enclosed with this representation is the initial scheme layout prepared by my client's architects, which has been based upon the conclusions of the assessment work undertaken to date and which will form the basis of pre-application discussions with the City Council.

2 Ecology aspects

The comments contained within the site assessment with respect to biodiversity and the significance of Oil Mill Beck have been noted and are being specifically addressed as part of working up the redevelopment scheme for the site.

Both an Ecologist and a Landscape

Architect have been appointed as part of my clients design team and they are working closely with my clients architect to take due account of this aspect as part of an overall enhancement proposal in this location. I can confirm that my clients freehold title extends right up to Oil Mill Beck and therefore

includes the banking between the beck and the main site. Consequently, the requirements identified in the site assessment are considered capable of being achieved.

3 FLOOD RISK ASPECTS

[Representation includes statement on flood risk from Weetwood Services Ltd – text copied below]:

Leeds City Council's Site Allocation Plan (June 2013) identifies the Horsforth Mills site (off Low Lane, Horsforth) for potential residential development (site reference 402t).

A review of the Sustainability Allocations Report indicates that the site scores "Red" for Sustainability Appraisal Objective 14 - Flood Risk and the site has been assessed overall as "Amber" because "The site is in flood zone 3 (high risk)".

Prior to 2009, the EA flood map of the site indicated that the site was almost entirely located in Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding). The EA has since updated the flood map and the revised map indicates that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 3 (high risk of flooding).

The EA regional modelling team has confirmed (in July 2013) that it does not hold any records of the site flooding, and that the flood map revision has been derived by solely by application of its National Generalised Model (NGM).

The NGM approach is used by the EA for flood mapping when it does not have a site specific hydraulic model of a watercourse. It is accepted that it can be subject to significant uncertainty in some circumstances which can lead to significant errors in the flood map.

It is concluded that there is considerable uncertainty in the flood zone classification of the site.

To address this Weetwood Services Ltd is undertaking a detailed technical study of the site. This entails the development of a one-dimensional hydraulic model of Oil Mill Beck, immediately upstream, alongside and downstream of the site. The beck channel will be represented by cross sectional information from a channel survey, and key hydraulic structures, such as the bridges upstream and downstream of the site will also be represented with survey data.

North Comments

Name: Rhodes Asset Management Ltd

Representor No: PRS06441 Representation ID: REP07515

The Oil Beck hydraulic model will provide accurate predictions of flood levels at and in the vicinity of the site. These will be used in conjunction with new topographic survey information of the site to accurately derive the flood outlines at the site. The modelling study will also examine the impact of potential bridge blockage to ensure that residual risk from this source is fully understood.

The hydraulic modelling will be undertaken in close consultation with the EA regional modelling team, and may lead to the EA flood zone categorisation of the site being revised to confirm that the site is not at high risk of flooding.

A site specific flood risk assessment is currently being undertaken and the FRA report, informed by best available flood information from the EA and also from Leeds City Council (the local lead flood authority), will present the detailed modelling work undertaken to ensure a robust evidence base.

3. flood risk mitigation

It is expected that the site specific FRA will demonstrate that the site could be developed for residential use in accordance with the National planning policy Framework (NPPF) and local policy. That is, that the development:

1. Would be safe for its lifetime, including the effects of climate change. 2. Would not increase flood risk elsewhere.

It is expected that flood risk mitigation measures will be required. The scope of these measures will depend on the findings of the modelling study discussed in Section 2 but may include flood resistance/resilience design and construction, the implementation of a flood management plan for site residents, a sequentially planned site layout, and a surface water drainage system that reduces peak runoff rates from the site thereby reducing flood risk further downstream (see Section 4).

It is also possible that the building footprint of the developed site will be less than the existing site and that a new area of flood storage could be made available on the site, if required. However, this is subject to confirmation following the modelling study and the site masterplanning process.

4. surface water management

An outline surface water management scheme is currently being prepared for the site based on the principles of sustainable drainage (SuDS).

The volume of attenuation storage required to restrict surface water runoff rates to existing Greenfield rates and to store the 1 in 100 year storm event (including allowance for a 30% increase in rainfall intensity in order to allow for the effects of climate change) have been determined.

The proposed surface water drainage scheme would provide betterment for through an overall reduction in peak post development runoff rates for a 1 in 30 year storm event and greater.

Summary - The EA flood map in the vicinity of the site has been derived using an approach which can be subject to considerable errors in certain circumstances and it is likely that the EA flood map significantly overstates flood risk at the site. As a result, detailed hydraulic modelling is being undertaken to better understand flood risk at the site and more accurately map flood risk in the vicinity of the site. It is expected that the findings this may demonstrate that flood risk is not a development constraint to the site and lead to a formal update to the EA flood map. Notwithstanding the above, it is expected that the site specific flood risk assessment currently being undertaken will demonstrate that:

1. The site could be developed for residential use

2. That the development would be safe for its lifetime taking into account climate change (as required by the National Planning Policy Framework)

3. The development of the site would reduce flood risk elsewhere (as encouraged by the NPPF, the EA and Leeds City Council).

4 Other Matters

In addition to the three key aspects identified above, it is considered that the Horsforth Mills site has the following credentials for housing allocation under the green status colouration:

i) It is a brownfield site.

ii) It is located in a highly sustainable location.

iii) Residential development exists adjacent to the site.

iv) There is no prospect or likely re-use of the site for employment purposes.

v) The site through both conversion and new build will provide a valuable addition of housing supply as part of the residual requirement figure for the north area of the district.

vi) All technical, infrastructural and environmental aspects can be appropriately addressed and will be supplemented in due course with additional detail to confirm this.

vii) In conservation area terms, the redevelopment of the site focused around a sensitive refurbishment of the principal mill building, selective demolition of visually unattractive building additions and well related new build, will lead to the preservation and it is considered the enhancement of the conservation area character is this location.

My clients request therefore that the Horsforth Mills site is specifically allocated for residential development and given a green colouration status within the Plan and identified with a capacity of circa 100 units reflective of the redevelopment scheme currently under preparation for formal application submission.

North Comments

Name: Gary Rhodes

Representor No: PRS02439 **Representation ID:** REP04700

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree Theres going to be no space left for wildlife and plants The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Traffic is a problem already without any increase Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree Our services are already at breaking point The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree More buildings there are the less drainage will be Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree There is getting less and less natural wildlife habitat

North Comments

Name: Tracey Riach

Representor No: PRS01474 **Representation ID:** REP03608

Question Ref: G17

Carr Manor 2055

I am appalled to the proposals for housing to replace Stonegate Road Allotments. We need to maintain our greenspaces which benefit the community greatly.

North Comments

Name: David Riach

Representor No: PRS01475 **Representation ID:** REP03609

Question Ref: G17

Carr Manor 2055

I am aposed to the plans for housing on the Stongate Road Allotment Site. You should be looking at Green Belt land instead

North Comments

Name: Terrace Richardson

Representor No: PRS00609 **Representation ID:** REP02563

Question Ref: G17

2055 The site should remain as a green belt used for allotments and should not be used for building.

North Comments

Name: Shirley Richardson

Representor No: PRS00615 **Representation ID:** REP02598

Question Ref: G17

2055 The site should not be used for building. It should remain as allotments.

North Comments

Name: Anthony Richardson

Representor No: PRS00619 **Representation ID:** REP02602

Question Ref: G17

2055 I do not think the "Carr Manor" estate & allotments should be released for housing primarily as we are users of the allotments. My son's great grandfather has had a plot on this allotment for many years. The space is invaluable to our wider family in terms of the pleasure it brings, the food it produces and the existing allotment community present there. We are educating our child as to how food grows and he is directly interacting with nature and seeing the fruits of labour first hand. Due to the lack of allotment space in Moortown any removal of this allotment space would further lessen the available plots local to the area. No members in our family have large enough gardens to grow food therefore they are essential to our ability to grow wholesome food, particularly invaluable at a time when food prices continue to increase and children seem more detached from knowing and consuming healthy food.

North Comments

Name: Nicola Richardson

Representor No: PRS00629 **Representation ID:** REP02613

Question Ref: G17

2055 This land should remain as green space and continue as allotments as it has been for many years. The allotments provide important space to members of our community to use the land as it should be used; to grow crops. It would be a travesty if this space was built on.

North Comments

Name: Richardson

Representor No: PRS00879 **Representation ID:** REP02899

Question Ref: G17

Question G17- Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace or released for housing.

The allotments on Stonegate road provide a number of important benefits for the local community;

- Many of the users of the allotment are retired, and for some this is an important opportunity for social interaction as well as exercise, contributing to mental and physical wellbeing
- The current economic climate makes it more important than ever for people to have the opportunity to grow their own produce.
- cheap source of fresh fruit and vegetables, and therefore a healthy diet
- sense of achievement and well-being
- giving your mind something positive to focus on
- reduction in stress
- environment benefits by providing green spaces and wildlife habitats
- a chance for children to learn where food comes from.

I have reviewed the minutes of the Leeds City Council Allotments working group. I was pleased to see that when challenged, the council reaffirmed their commitment to increasing the number of plots available (minutes of the meeting of 26th July 2012).

Whilst I can appreciate the need to increase the availability of affordable housing, closing a site would seem to run contrary to the statutory obligation to increase availability.

North Comments

Name: Joseph Richardson

Representor No: PRS01013 Representation ID: REP03072

Question Ref: H1

1199 RepIDComRefComInComSiteLinkComRefAssumedComRefPapText24

REP03069"1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

The infrastructure of Cookridge is already overstretched, schools, healthcare, emergency services.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

I have two young children and our estate(Dale Parks) is already a rat-run. This will become worse and is very worrying.

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

Cookridge schools are already oversubscribed.

4.The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

Cookridge sits on many springs which drain into these fields.

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

For the developers to claim that they will improve the ecology of the site is disgraceful.

There are many species of birds and invertebrates, amphibians, roe deer and badgers use these fields regularly. Foxes live here. You can not improve ecology by constructing houses. The developers are insulting my intelligence by claiming you can."0119984087

North Comments

Name: Richardson

Representor No: PRS02476 **Representation ID:** REP04744

Question Ref: H4

I would like to object to the building of housing on Victoria Avenue. The road is already busy with traffic, i.e school bus going to and from school. We already have trouble getting on to New Road Side with all the cars going to college. There is also grid lock around the roundabout going onto the ring road, more cars will make it difficult to get onto the main road.

North Comments

Name: Julie Richardson

Representor No: PRS02634 **Representation ID:** REP05079

Question Ref: H1

- 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Julie Richardson

Representor No: PRS02634 Representation ID: REP05079

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Julie Richardson

Representor No: PRS02634 Representation ID: REP05079

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Julie Richardson

Representor No: PRS02634 **Representation ID:** REP05079

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Julie Richardson

Representor No: PRS02634 Representation ID: REP05079

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Julie Richardson

Representor No: PRS02634 Representation ID: REP05079

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in not way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided..., then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: Julie Richardson

Representor No: PRS02634 **Representation ID:** REP05079

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Jane Richardson

Representor No: PRS05290 **Representation ID:** REP05889

Question Ref: H4

I wish to oppose the potential new housing on the fields off Victoria avenue, site 1202. The impact the heavily increased traffic would bring would be dangerous to pedestrians and vehicles alike. I live at 9 Victoria mount and between 8.30am - 9am and between 3.15 - 3.45 Victoria mount. Victoria crescent especially are very congested and I think dangerous, my neighbour used to arrive home from work at 3.30pm and she now stays at work for a while longer as driving up Victoria mount is a nightmare at that time. Any plans that involve potentially any increase in traffic should be scrapped. The top of Victoria mount around the junction of Victoria avenue is also a dangerous junction, the double bend is already a nightmare and any increase in traffic using that and the volume of traffic on calverly lane makes this plan very unacceptable to me. Thank you for asking for our opinions, I hope that this plan will be opposed.

North Comments

Name: Les Richardson

Representor No: PRS05318 Representation ID: REP05913

Question Ref: H4

Having spoken to and written to councillor Chris Townsley and attended meetings at Horsforth church hall regarding my opposition to the development of 550 houses on the old Clariant and riverside sites { where i was among one of the 99% of people opposing the development } and at which the developers were not represented but at which two two Leeds City Council members did attend, to be subsequently informed that MP Pickles had agreed to the development on the recommendation of Leeds City Council, i have little faith in believing that my views or that of others living on Victoria

Mount will be considered when the final decision is made by the Council.

My main reason for objecting about the development of the Clariant site was simply that the infrastructure would not cope with an additional 550 homes with probably about 1000 adults and at least 1000 children in regards schools, doctors surgeries, dentists and mostly the roads. I, when working had to negotiate both Horsforth and Rodley roundabouts on the ring road know that at peak times the traffic is almost gridlocked in all four directions.

I live on Victoria Mount with a junior school at the bottom and a college at the top and at drop off areas in the morning and pick up areas in the late afternoon the traffic at top and bottom and areas in between are becoming very congested. added to this problem is the fact that the Victorias are used as a "cat-run" every morning to cut out the heavy traffic on New Road Side.

The development of an additional 200 homes off Victoria Avenue will result in Victoria Mount becoming an Accident Black Spot.

If the development goes ahead i hope you can live with the consequences.

North Comments

Name: John Richardson

Representor No: PRS05806 Representation ID: REP06507

Question Ref: H4

I am writing with regard to the above application for residential development to which i am totally opposed on the grounds of access and the completely inadequate infrastructure in the area to support such a substantial development.

Having lived in the area for nearly 40 years I have seen the roads in the area deteriorate to such an extent that the roundabout where the A65 crosses the ring road is gridlocked twice a day and the roads through the Victorias are becoming impassable due to parked vehicles and others using it as rat run to bypass the A65 jam to get across the ring road roundabout.

North Comments

Name: Dr Stephen, Sian, Megan, Jack Richards

Representor No: PRS05725 Representation ID: REP06394

Question Ref: H1

2) 1199 land of Moseley Wood gardens (colour coded green)

I would like to object in the strongest possible terms to the designation for the above site at Moseley Wood Bottom that has been earmarked for a large housing development by Taylor Wimpey.

There are a number of physical and social geographical reasons, together with ecological reasons why this site must be returned to green belt status. These are set out below.

1) This is a green field site. Once built on it is lost forever. The whole infrastructure would not support a development of this size. The roads and access are not good enough to support any building work traffic let alone another 200-300 cars once built. With the exception of Tesco express, a newsagent and post office there are no other facilities in Cookridge. The school is already at maximum capacity and it is not clear how this would be addressed. The additional number of parents dropping of children at school would be very dangerous. Community police are already involved with parking and traffic offences outside Holy Trinity school at start and finish times. There are no general practitioner surgery in Cookridge. Most residents travel to Holt Park or Tinsill or Headingley.

Winter weather in Cookridge is significantly worse than in any other part of Leeds due to its elevated position. Snow remains on the ground for considerably longer than most other areas. Quite how any building access would continue through this is not planned for nor how the additional 200-300 cars would manage to get out to the main roads. Bus routes do not seem a viable option as the surrounding Moseley Wood road structure is too narrow and choked with resident parking.

With increasing cold winters and heavy rain, the current land is invaluable as a run off and drainage for excess surface water. 200 hundred new houses will effectively remove this natural resource and cause flooding of Moseley Beck and the railway line with consequent disruption to rail services. Residents downstream on Wood Hill Road and Horsforth Woodside will be affected by increased flash flooding.

2) The building of houses on Moseley Wood Bottom would have a detrimental effect on the quality of life for my family and myself. The reason we live in Cookridge is because of the fields, the open spaces and absence of shops and other facilities. It currently still retains some of its village character which would be largely destroyed by a new, substantial housing development. I note that a number of residents on Moseley Wood gardens have already put their houses up for sale.

3) The current area is a haven for wildlife. The current inaccessibility of the area of Moseley Wood Bottom and the adjacent woodland areas means that there is an abundance of flora and fauna. I have a personnel record of over 50 species of Birds alone in this area (full details available if required). There are numerous frogs, newts and toads present that would be threatened by any proposed development. Numerous other small and large mammals are present including bats, weasels, shrews, foxes, deer and badgers. The fields are regularly (twice a day) patrolled by Red Kites. I would also expect that the area is very important for insects, particularly the bee population. Opening access to the surrounding woodland would have a detrimental effect on the wildlife that currently has a great deal of undisturbed habitat. This is one of the main reasons we chose Cookridge as place to live so my children could recognize the importance of wildlife.

It is my view that the Council should prioritize building on brownfield sites throughout the city first before any consideration is given to any of the green field/green belt sites.

The environmental impact of a huge housing development on Moseley Wood Bottom fields would be devastating and result in a severe reduction in quality of life for residents, major environmental damage and loss of habitat for many animals and plant species.

Question Ref: H7

1151 Cookridge Lane, 3044 Cookridge Hall Golf Club, 3360 Cookridge Hall (all red green belt sites).

I would like to support the council's designation for the above sites as they contribute strongly to the character and identity of Cookridge Village.

North Comments

Name: Jill Richmond

Representor No: PRS00976 Representation ID: REP03026

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

200 houses in Moseley bottom will increase pollution including carbon monoxide to the detriment of peoples health.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

Moseley wood Gardens is narrow with dangerous bends.

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

We do not have any health centre nearest at Holt Park. The schools are already full.

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Agree

Several springs drain into the field causing flooding over the years.

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

Numerous bird species visit the greenfield and gardens , together with other wildlife foxes, badgers, newts etc. without a place for nature. Nature will disappear.

North Comments

Name: Marjorie Richmond

Representor No: PRS02682 Representation ID: REP05133

Question Ref: H1

Green to Red.

1199 Land of Moseley Wood.

I think brown field sites should be used 1st. Boarded up houses should be brought back into use. This is the only wild green space in Cookridge and wild life would be lost. There will be increased flood risk as the whole estate slopes down to this land. there will be increased greenhouse gases. The road system will be more overloaded with much damage to already damaged roads. Parking at Horsforth station is not adequate now, so more cars there will cause more trouble. The schools and doctor's are already unable to cope with the present population, so more would cause trouble.

North Comments

Name: Joanne Riley

Representor No: PRS01378 **Representation ID:** REP03503

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Agree. Primary schools are full but secondary school is not. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Unsure. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Agree.

North Comments

Name: K Riley

Representor No: PRS02016 **Representation ID:** REP04215

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly Agree Too much traffic, rat runs & noise may be accidents due to more cars. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly Agree We in cookridge live here because it is a quiet residential area and horse riding here is very popular. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly Agree The local school is full at present. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Strongly Agree The land will certainly be more prone to flooding with more houses on fields. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly Agree Many animals (deer, foxes and Herons) frequent the area.

North Comments

Name: C Riley

Representor No: PRS02523 **Representation ID:** REP04809

Question Ref: H7

3034 Bayton Lane - Red

I totally agree that this site is not suitable for new housing. Main reasons are inadequate roads schools & doctors.

North Comments

Name: C Riley

Representor No: PRS02523 Representation ID: REP04812

Question Ref: H7

3327 Land at Rawdon - Red.

I totally agree that this site is not suitable for new housing. Main reasons are inadequate roads schools & doctors.

Question Ref: H7

3330 Land at Rawdon - Red

I totally agree that this site is not suitable for new housing. Main reasons are inadequate roads schools & doctors.

Question Ref: H7

3328 Land at Rawdon - Red

I totally agree that this site is not suitable for new housing. Main reasons are inadequate roads schools & doctors.

North Comments

Name: Juan Riley

Representor No: PRS04501 **Representation ID:** REP00984

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

The sites identified as green in cookridge i cannot say if this is suitable but it appears to be building on green fields which i disagree with. There should be more commitment to investigating and promoting development of brownfield sites. This would be more environmentally and commercially sound.

Question Ref: H2

I disagree with the development of all proposed sites that are unnecessary. Sites: 1095B, 1369, 1095C and 1095D coloured amber by your scheme i totally disagree with the proposed plan for housing development. These proposed sites should never have made it to the planning offices. There has not been any consideration given or provided by the government in their initial proposal housing drafts as to the importance of these sites to the local community, leeds, England and its people. This document is an attempt by yourselves to see democracy in action and fulfill your obligations to this effect. The proposed housing development stated would destroy the environment of Pool village with the loss of its unique character as a village. The country surroundings would be destroyed to detriment of its heritage and of its fauna and flora of country and the river wharfe. The sites in question provide a wild life corridor for Otley Chevin and Quarry old bank woods to access the open countryside of the dale beyond. The housing estate development would block this. The fields are medieval in origin and are unique to the region providing attraction for tourism and recreation. This housing estate would require building infrastructure incorporating new access roads, schools, shops, parking and facilities that would further destroy the village and harm it peoples quality of life. The argument for a need to provide new housing to meet housing shortages is a red herring. Pool is a very expensive area that attracts property at the highest premium. It is part of the so called 'golden triangle'; of expensive areas in west yorkshire. In this respect pool is not the place to provide social housing and is not the place for development. The land for sale for proposed building is advertised to appeal to building speculators to build country residences. People with such wealth are not homeless. There is very little employment opportunities locally and so the majority of residents work in the city and local towns.

Question Ref: H3

I do not agree in any such development as previously outlined. Further and deeper exploration should be sought for developing brownfield sites as well as even considering building a new town in such larger industrial areas near to motorways etc.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

I disagree with building on green field sites in total for reasons already provided.

Question Ref: H6

na

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

site 1095a is along a flood plain, along the river wharfe that would harm wildlife. This site would also damage the heritage of pool being near to important buildings and archaeology of the village.

Question Ref: H9

Yes sites 1095B, 1369, 1095c and 1095D should not be considered to be built on for the previous reasons sited and highlighted due to historical, environmental and social implications.

Question Ref: H10

I am not qualified to provide this information but suffice to say brownfield sites should be considered if such development was a necessity.

Question Ref: H11

I do not agree with the leading questions and proposals for building in the areas of north west leeds.

Question Ref: H12

I am not qualified to answer this question. I do not understand or have knowledge of the possible social, environmental, economic and health problems that may arise with such plans.

Question Ref: H13

I do not no.

North Comments

Name: Juan Riley

Representor No: PRS04501 **Representation ID:** REP00984

Question Ref: H14

i do not no.

Question Ref: H15

i do not no.

Question Ref: General comment

none.

North Comments

Name: Jane Riley

Representor No: PRS06138 **Representation ID:** REP07008

Question Ref: H1

RESPONSE TO PROPOSALS ON POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES IN ADEL 'GREEN' SITES

Question H1 and H2: Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'green' represent the most suitable sites to consider allocating for future housing development? Which sites do you disagree with and why?

We object to the Council's designation of the site 1178A, the land south of Dunstarn Lane, Adel as "green" for development. This is currently within the green belt and as a point of principle green belt land should be maintained as such. Maintaining the quality of the environment is already identified as a priority by the Council to maintain, protect and enhance the quality of life for the population, and promote both physical and mental wellbeing. There is no clear argument at all for developing a green belt site when there are so many brownfield sites nearby for which approval has already been given, which will generate significant amounts of housing capacity in the immediate area. Instead, this site should be classified as "red".

Question Ref: H4

'AMBER' SITES

H4 and H5: Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development? Which sites do you disagree with and why?

We disagree that the following site should be identified as Amber: Site number 2130, Church Lane, Adel (Protected Area of Search site). This site plays an important role in preserving the distinctive character and visual appeal of the area.

In addition, further housing in the area will place an even greater strain on the infrastructure (highways, education and primary health care): there are already stresses on the existing capacity and any further development will exacerbate this still further. Instead, we would suggest that this site should be put back as a Protected Area of Search (PAS) site in the Development Plan.

Question Ref: H7

'RED' SITES

H7 and H8: Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'red' are not suitable for allocation for future housing development?

We support the Council's designation of the following sites as "red" sites:

1079: Long Causeway, Adel

2052: Tile Lane, Adel

1178B: Land south of Dunstarn Lane, Adel

1243 and 1246: Former rectory/paddock, Back Church Lane, Adel

All of these areas are currently in the green belt: it is important for the quality of life in the area that green belt should be preserved. In addition, once there is any encroachment on to green belt, it may become more difficult for the Council to defend its designation of green belt elsewhere. There is a real risk that Adel will become very much over-developed. The existing permissions will already increase the local population by a substantial amount in a very short period of time.

Further, there are already issues about the capacity of the local infrastructure to cope with the existing population (including schools, primary health care and highways, and the amount of green space accessible to the public including for allotments and to promote healthier lifestyles).

The Council needs to carry out a thorough and urgent review of the infrastructure needs of the area and present a robust analysis and action plan setting out how it will resolve these issues in both the short and longer terms.

We look forward to hearing about next steps, and in particular the Council's plans and timescales for producing the analysis and action plan for the existing and future infrastructure of crucial services.

North Comments

Name: Joan I Ripley

Representor No: PRS00618 **Representation ID:** REP02601

Question Ref: G17

2055 Re. Stonegate Road allotment site Carr Manor

I feel very concerned to hear about what's proposed for Stonegate Road allotments. How can you justify the closure of this valuable asset to this area. We need to preserve green spaces. We need to promote the growing of our own food, which makes for a healthy public. Other Councils seem to be more forward thinking than Leeds in many areas of life.

North Comments

Name: John Ripley

Representor No: PRS00621 **Representation ID:** REP02603

Question Ref: G17

2055 Re. Stonegate allotments Carr Manor

This site should remain as allotment land it is an asset to the area & should not be polluted by housing retain it as Green space.

North Comments

Name: Mark Ripley

Representor No: PRS02331 **Representation ID:** REP04582

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Myles Ritson

Representor No: PRS05269 **Representation ID:** REP05865

Question Ref: H4

This is to register our concern over classification of site 1202 for residential development on 2 grounds 1. Loss of rare open space amenity close to school 2. Increased traffic down a road which already creates issues for children walking to Newlithes and Froebelian schools - traffic speeds, path often obscured by overhanging trees, path in places narrow and in poor repair Yours sincerely [x]

North Comments

Name: Nina Ritson

Representor No: PRS05317 **Representation ID:** REP05912

Question Ref: H4

I would like to register my concerns over the classification of site 1202 for residential development on 2 grounds

1. Loss of rare open space amenity close to school which my children and many others in the area use to unwind on and meet others in the community to play with
 2. Increased traffic down a road which already creates issues for children walking to Newlaithes and Froebelian schools - traffic speeds, path often obscured by overhanging trees, path in places narrow and in poor repair
- I trust that with so many other spaces available for development that this precious open space in an otherwise built up area will be kept for the benefit of all in the area.

North Comments

Name: Antonia Roberts

Representor No: PRS01433 Representation ID: REP03563

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Antonia Roberts

Representor No: PRS01433 Representation ID: REP03563

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Antonia Roberts

Representor No: PRS01433 Representation ID: REP03563

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Antonia Roberts

Representor No: PRS01433 Representation ID: REP03563

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Antonia Roberts

Representor No: PRS01433 Representation ID: REP03563

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Antonia Roberts

Representor No: PRS01433 **Representation ID:** REP03563

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: M Roberts

Representor No: PRS02424 Representation ID: REP04685

Question Ref: H1

- 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: M Roberts

Representor No: PRS02424 Representation ID: REP04685

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site 1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: M Roberts

Representor No: PRS02424 Representation ID: REP04685

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: M Roberts

Representor No: PRS02424 Representation ID: REP04685

Question Ref: H1

- 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: M Roberts

Representor No: PRS02424 Representation ID: REP04685

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: M Roberts

Representor No: PRS02424 Representation ID: REP04685

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in not way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: M Roberts

Representor No: PRS02424 Representation ID: REP04685

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 — LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Brenda Roberts

Representor No: PRS03452 Representation ID: REP00263

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

See H2 for main reasons

Question Ref: H2

Site 1199 - land off Moseley Wood GardensA housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic and we do not have the infrastructure to cope with it.Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times and the situation will worsen with the new development.The development will impact on the local schools with school places becoming an issue.Flooding may become a problem on the railway line with surface run off.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

North Comments

Name: Douglas Roberts

Representor No: PRS03469 Representation ID: REP00264

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

See H2 below.

Question Ref: H2

Site 1199 - land off Moseley Wood GardensA housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic and Cookridge does not have the infrastructure to cope with this. Woodhill Road and Green Lane are extremely busy at peak times and a new development would worsen the situation.The development would impact on local schools and medical facilities.Flooding may become a problem on the railway line, with services delayed or cancelled.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

North Comments

Name: Roz Roberts

Representor No: PRS05339 Representation ID: REP05936

Question Ref: H4

I disagree with building of houses near to Victoria Avenue and Newlaithes School. This area is busy enough with school traffic and lots of houses should not be built here.

There needs to be green land kept in this area of Horsforth and should not be overbuilt on.

My postcode is [x]

This is my formal objection.

North Comments

Name: Elaine Robinson

Representor No: PRS02122 **Representation ID:** REP04345

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom - Green to Red.

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Building more houses is only going to put more pressure on already stretched services.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem, already it is a problem along Moseley Wood Grdens & the surrounding roads.

Local schools such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand, having to wait for appointments due to demand.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this, parents garden has been flooded a lot more in recent years.

Moseley Bottom ia an important wildlife habitat, the diversity of wildlife will be severley affected. Already wild life, especially insects are under threat.

North Comments

Name: James Robinson

Representor No: PRS03748 Representation ID: REP00077

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

Yes because it uses small plots that are too small for recreational use.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

ref 1202.1)This site is opposite Newlaithes school and is used by the children for playing football and general open air play. This area is a bit too far away from hall park to be reached by small children so the open space is vital for healthy open air activity.2) The Victoria area has narrow road and building more houses will add to congestion.3) Horsforth High school is oversubscribed,if more houses are built more scholl places need providing.

Question Ref: H5

ref 1202.1)This site is opposite Newlaithes school and is used by the children for playing football and general open air play. This area is a bit too far away from hall park to be reached by small children so the open space is vital for healthy open air activity.2) The Victoria area has narrow road and building more houses will add to congestion.3) Horsforth High school is oversubscribed,if more houses are built more scholl places need providing.

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H14

Ref 4056Elderly because it is near the centre of the village so elderly can wal to shops and doctors.

North Comments

Name: Phil Robinson

Representor No: PRS04542 **Representation ID:** REP00100

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Site 1199I understand the need to increase the number of houses in Leeds but school capacity and road infrastructure are my big concerns for building of houses in this area. I know of several families who have children refused from local Schools (Holy Trinity, Cookridge Primary etc) so they are already struggling to cope with the existing population. Adding another 150-200+ children without plans for in increase in School's capacity is a real concern. Traffic throughout the city is a problem especially in rush hour but the links into Leeds centre from North Leeds are particularly weak, if you consider routes through Otley road and Headingley are very congested as it is. There are also concerns regarding drainage as this area is particularly hard hit in the winter months with rain/heavy snow and flooding will damage houses and the rail links.

Question Ref: H2

Site 1199I understand the need to increase the number of houses in Leeds but school capacity and road infrastructure are my big concerns for building of houses in this area. I know of several families who have children refused from local Schools (Holy Trinity, Cookridge Primary etc) so they are already struggling to cope with the existing population. Adding another 150-200+ children without plans for in increase in School's capacity is a real concern. Traffic throughout the city is a problem especially in rush hour but the links into Leeds centre from North Leeds are particularly weak, if you consider routes through Otley road and Headingley are very congested as it is. There are also concerns regarding drainage as this area is particularly hard hit in the winter months with rain/heavy snow and flooding will damage houses and the rail links.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

Site 1199I understand the need to increase the number of houses in Leeds but school capacity and road infrastructure are my big concerns for building of houses in this area. I know of several families who have children refused from local Schools (Holy Trinity, Cookridge Primary etc) so they are already struggling to cope with the existing population. Adding another 150-200+ children without plans for in increase in School's capacity is a real concern. Traffic throughout the city is a problem especially in rush hour but the links into Leeds centre from North Leeds are particularly weak, if you consider routes through Otley road and Headingley are very congested as it is. There are also concerns regarding drainage as this area is particularly hard hit in the winter months with rain/heavy snow and flooding will damage houses and the rail links.

Question Ref: H7

y

North Comments

Name: Dave Robinson

Representor No: PRS04610 Representation ID: REP01229

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Aireborough doesn't have the infrastructure for the current population, never mind a higher one. Roads are frequently gridlocked, not just at rush hour, there is totally inadequate public transport especially along the Rawdon lights to Guiseley section of the A65. The schools are all full, doctors surgeries are full with long waits for appointments

Question Ref: H2

All of the sites for the reasons above, but mainly 1221. The site is used by the residents of Westfield, who without access to a park use it for dog walking, children playing, and sledging. It is criss-crossed with footpaths which have been in use for at least 50 years. The land is also run-off for water from areas of the Westfield Estate above it, and Yeadon north of the A65, and is therefore frequently boggy as the soil is very clayey, and the stream is known to flood, which at the moment isn't an issue, but houses built on it will be at risk of flooding, and houses down hill of the site will also be put at risk. The land is also home to a large number of mature trees and varied wildlife. The site would add considerable traffic to the already congested A65, as the public transport is inadequate, unreliable and expensive, and the site is located in a place where a car is required for shopping, doctors entertainment and employment. The local schools are full to capacity, as are the doctor and dental surgeries.

Question Ref: H3

No, not in Aireborough, the area is already too heavily populated without adequate infrastructure. There are plenty of empty houses and brown field sites closer to Leeds city centre that are close to school spaces and which have good public transport links

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Not in Aireborough, see above for issues regarding infrastructure

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

3034 and 3326, Rawdon Billing is an greenbelt area with outstanding beauty and varied wildlife that need preserving

Question Ref: H9

All sites in Aireborough should be red, as none are suitable for development due to above listed infrastructure issues

North Comments

Name: Kate Robinson

Representor No: PRS05285 Representation ID: REP05883

Question Ref: H4

I am formally objecting to the plans to build houses on 1202: Land off Victoria Avenue Horsforth. This would destroy the precious green space in the area that makes Horsforth so nice and put far too much extra pressure on the already too busy traffic infrastructure in this area.

North Comments

Name: Helen Robson

Representor No: PRS02192 **Representation ID:** REP04424

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree Too much traffic already The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Katie Roche

Representor No: PRS03295 Representation ID: REP00670

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

I don't think there is any more capacity in this area for a large scale development. I don't think of any of the green belt in the Rawdon area should be re-designated. Rawdon is an attractive village which would suffer from an influx of up to 175 properties.

Question Ref: H2

Site 3329: Land to rear of 22-66 Layton Lane, Rawdon
Site 3331: Land at Knott Lane/Layton Lane at Knott Lane/Layton Lane, Rawdon LS19 6JW
Site 4095: Land to West of Knott Lane, Rawdon, LS19 6JW
It seems to me that this would vastly overload the infrastructure of Rawdon, especially roads. The A65 and the road through Rawdon are already extremely busy and there is standing traffic for long periods during the rush hour each day. In addition the schools could not cope with the extra numbers, and sewage and other services would be placed under severe strain. The land at site 3329 borders Gill Beck which is a site of much wildlife which would be displaced by the disruption of the building. Rawdon is not the place for large-scale developments of this nature. A smaller, less intrusive development which would impact less on the environment, both natural and in terms of infrastructure, might be possible.

Question Ref: H3

n/a

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

I don't know

Question Ref: H5

As before: Site 3329, Site 3331, Site 4095

Question Ref: H6

n/a

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Site 2119, 3034, 3326
Rawdon Billing is a local amenity, an area of outstanding natural beauty and a place which defines Rawdon's character and should never be allowed to be changed from its Red allocation

Question Ref: H8

n/a

Question Ref: H9

n/a

Question Ref: H10

Not in the Rawdon area. I don't know about anywhere else

Question Ref: H11

no.

Question Ref: H12

No.

Question Ref: H13

n/a

Question Ref: H14

The three sites I have mentioned: 3329, 4095, 3331 would be more suitable for elderly accommodation in as much as there would be less use of roads by elderly residents, and no school issues, but there are no nearby amenities.

North Comments

Name: Katie Roche

Representor No: PRS03295 **Representation ID:** REP00670

Question Ref: H15

n/a

North Comments

Name: Alan Rodger

Representor No: PRS02626 **Representation ID:** REP04929

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Alan Rodger

Representor No: PRS02626 Representation ID: REP04929

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Alan Rodger

Representor No: PRS02626 Representation ID: REP04929

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Alan Rodger

Representor No: PRS02626 **Representation ID:** REP04929

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Alan Rodger

Representor No: PRS02626 Representation ID: REP04929

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Alan Rodger

Representor No: PRS02626 Representation ID: REP04929

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Alan Rodger

Representor No: PRS02626 **Representation ID:** REP04929

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Karen Rogan

Representor No: PRS01295 Representation ID: REP03403

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments - Strongly agree.

To build such a huge development would create a disaster! Rat-runs through all the existing housing. But would the developers care.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree.

Traffic is always a problem and again rush hour traffic and 'rat runs' would be so dangerous!!

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly agree. All schools are struggling with existing children in the area, please, no more.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding, More building will affect this - Strongly agree. Flooding would be a huge issue. 'Climate change' is happening and extremely heavy rainfall would be a disaster waiting to happen if this development went ahead.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree.

My strongest issue- we need to conserve all wildlife!! Foxes, deer, newts found in the area would be wiped out. Along with all kinds of birds . This is wrong!!!

North Comments

Name: Peter Rogerson

Representor No: PRS04203 Representation ID: REP01460

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

In my opinion, the site is not suitable for several reasons. It lies very low within the local topography, the land is wet, this is a valuable natural asset- a green area in an area surrounded by much housing. We need to keep isolated areas of green land within these built up areas. It is important visually and to keep the natural environment, trees, animals, birds, insects, flora and fauna. Access could also be a problem, this is on a busy bus route, and I believe that there is enough traffic in this particular area, we don't need any additional pressures with extra traffic, services etc. Its close proximity to the Holy Trinity Church graveyard, should also be a factor.

Question Ref: H2

Site Ref 1242 The Paddock, Church Lane, Meanwood, Leeds 6 Reasons as above, and we have also lost another green area, close by, in recent years, the old Meanwood Hospital (which is now the Woodlands housing estate.)

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H11

No, the site should never be developed. i.e. site ref 1242

Question Ref: H12

No

North Comments

Name: Rogers

Representor No: PRS01535 **Representation ID:** REP03676

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Strongly agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Wvh Rogers

Representor No: PRS05737 **Representation ID:** REP06407

Question Ref: H7

Site 1015: Hunger Hills and land south of Lee Lane West

I agree with the assessment that this site is not suitable for housing development.

North Comments

Name: Christine Rollett

Representor No: PRS01868 **Representation ID:** REP04040

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. I wish Cookridge Drive to remain a lovely quiet area to live in. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. See comments on the 1st page. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. Local schools already over subscribed. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. More housing will make flooding worse. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. There is nowhere else for a wildlife habitat if this area is built on.

North Comments

Name: Tim Rollett

Representor No: PRS04138 **Representation ID:** REP00631

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

I am concerned about one site registered as 'green'; as I disagree with the classification.

Question Ref: H2

SHLAA Ref 1199 Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge, LS16. I have viewed the proposals from the developer and do not consider the infrastructure of Cookridge can support the building of 200 houses on this site. The local roads are not wide enough and the extra traffic that the development would bring would also represent significant road safety issues for local residents and children. Cookridge was not designed for this extra population. In addition, I understand that local schools would struggle with the potential extra demand on places. The plans also show that there will be one road into the development - this would place pressure on the surrounding street and the increase in traffic would ruin the quality of the neighbourhood as well as the road safety issues already mentioned above. I am concerned that houses at the end of Cookridge Drive will be demolished to make way for another access road to the development - this is not on the plans for the development but it does concern me - are we being deceived about this?

Question Ref: H3

No

Question Ref: H4

y

Question Ref: H5

N/A

Question Ref: H6

N/A

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

n/a

Question Ref: H8

n/a

Question Ref: H9

n/a

Question Ref: H10

n/a

Question Ref: H11

N/A

Question Ref: H12

N/A

Question Ref: H13

N/A

Question Ref: H14

N/A

Question Ref: H15

N/A

North Comments

Name: Tim Rollett

Representor No: PRS04138 **Representation ID:** REP00631

Question Ref: General comment

My feedback relates to the Moseley Wood Gardens development only.

North Comments

Name: Paul Ronicle

Representor No: PRS05548 **Representation ID:** REP06195

Question Ref: H7

I am writing to express my concern and objection to the areas of Horsforth known as Hunger Hills Woods and West End to be included in land registers for potential future housing construction. This local green space offers an outstanding leisure and educational facility in the large conurbation of Leeds. It has extensive views and varied scenery and offers a diversity of wildlife which should be preserved as an amenity for all.

I live in Westbrook lane and consider that development requiring access from Westbrook Lane or lee lane East would be particularly undesirable. From a personal point of view I bought my current house due to the tranquillity of the locality, lack of through traffic and the aspect of mature trees and open fields.

From a more pragmatic point of view I have to say that the existing transport infrastructure would not support additional housing without being upgraded and widened, which would require the removal of the line of mature trees which line these roads.

Additionally, there are two schools serviced by these same routes- the primary on Westbrook lane and the secondary school on lee lane East. Concerns over safety for pupils have already dictated the installation of 'sleeping policemen' along Westbrook lane to moderate traffic speeds and protect children from traffic. I think it would be wholly inappropriate to increase potential traffic levels in these sensitive areas.

Westbrook Lane and the adjoining King Georges Field are greatly enjoyed by dog owners and walkers who value this wild and natural environment which offer something closer to nature than the alternative city parks such as that on Fink Hill. I myself greatly enjoy having access to the ancient woodland between Westbrook Lane and Lee Lane Farm with its diversity of wildlife and I walk through the woods for recreational purposes most weekends. I would be outraged if this area were designated for development.

Access to these woods for myself is from Lee Lane East and the ancient pack horse road - which must be of archaeological importance to the area- bounded by ancient hedgerow- itself a scarce and biologically diverse habitat.

Additionally, when I bought my house I noted in the land plan associated with the deeds references to coal mining in various locations, which I presume to be ancient bell-pits. Local legend has it that one of these contains human remains of a disaster from the last century, and as such the sanctity of the deceased remains should be respected and left undisturbed.

Within the Leeds area abundant brownfield sites exist and future developers should be encouraged and incentivised to use them, rather than the 'easy option' of developing the diminishing resource prime green belt land.

I sincerely hope you will take my points into consideration in ensuring that the area of Hunger Hills and West End are not included in future development land registers.

North Comments

Name: Veronical Ross

Representor No: PRS01286 **Representation ID:** REP03395

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Jason Ross

Representor No: PRS04324 Representation ID: REP00079

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

all green sites considered in horsforth are currently unused or require development/regeneration. Using these sites will prevent the need to use more unsuitable areas such as site 1202 & 731 which are untenable due to traffic and safety issues and the effect on the local school.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

for example site 1202. totally unsuitable as it would have to be combined with site 731 to form a loop road which would take all traffic past the local school and cause numerous safety issues. Both current roads could not support this volume of traffic due their width and build. The areas are also of beauty and support wildlife. There would also be a direct impact to an already stretched local primary school with the addition of a further 200 houses. The school is larger than average already and has no room for extension. Local residents would oppose development ferociously. Not a suitable site!!

Question Ref: H5

see previous answer and comment

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H12

no

North Comments

Name: Rachal Ross

Representor No: PRS04728 Representation ID: REP01669

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

some amber sites are not suitable as they are currently used and the local infrastructure can no longer sustain extra homesite 1202 is completely unsuitable due to it's close proximity to an already larger than average primary school

Question Ref: H5

1202 completely unsuitable as it is close to an already larger than average primary school. Traffic issue also.

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H9

1202 completely unsuitable for development due to insufficient local infrastructure

Question Ref: H11

4055 short4057 short

Question Ref: H12

no

Question Ref: H13

no

North Comments

Name: James Rotheram

Representor No: PRS01949 Representation ID: REP04133

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Cookridge regard itself as a village community. The infrastructure is not designed to handle more. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Green Lane, Woohill Road would suffer as a result of considerably more traffic. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Green Lane is at school pickup times is dangerous. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. I see the beck go from a quik flowing beck to a raging torrent spilling up gardens and encroaching on properties. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. We have wood peckers, tree creepers in our garden and have has a kingfisher. Increase housing will drive the wildlife away.

North Comments

Name: June Rotheram

Representor No: PRS01951 **Representation ID:** REP04134

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Population not growing as expected already empty properties. Develop brown sites of which there are many in & around leeds. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Inadequate road infrastructure to cope with additional housing. Peak hour traffic problems on surrounding roads. Potential public transport issues. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. All local schools already full to capacity medical service full. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Already flooding every year. Additional run of from development will make this worse. Affects surrounding houses already and also railway, trains delayed now. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Wildlife flora and fauna needs to be protected. Kingfisher, water voles&bats already there this land is the "lungs of leeds. We need these green spaces.

North Comments

Name: Alan Rothwell

Representor No: PRS05574 **Representation ID:** REP06225

Question Ref: H7

As a local resident who has lived in Horsforth for the last 75 years and witnessed the overdevelopment of housing over the years, I write to register my support for the NOT SUITABLE FOR ALLOCATION OF HOUSING CLASSIFICATION FOR THE ABOVE SITE.

Too much development has already been sanctioned in and around what was once the largest village in England. The site is one of the few areas of accessible open countryside remaining for residents and I wholeheartedly support the councils efforts to classify the site as unsuitable

North Comments

Name: Jennifer Rouse

Representor No: PRS01043 Representation ID: REP03106

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Stephen Rouse

Representor No: PRS01050 Representation ID: REP03112

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

Brown field sites should be exhausted before green land is used for building.

North Comments

Name: Matthew Rouse

Representor No: PRS01069 Representation ID: REP03135

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Gloria Rouse

Representor No: PRS01212 Representation ID: REP03315

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Coocridge does not need to become any biggerThe Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. The main Roads are busy already extra traffice will cause congestion & air quality will be affected. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The primary schools in cookridge are over subscribed there are no dental surgeries. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. As a resedent of Cookridge my back garden floods every time there is a heavy rainfall. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. During my time living next to Moseley Bottom I have witnessed wilidlife such as doe, Badgers, bats, foxes and a wholernage of dfferent birds.I would like to know reasons why these housing developments are not using brown area. Also within Leeds there are areas of houses that are boardedup thesecould be redeveloped . The area of Mosley bottom is not a suitable area to turn into an area of houses. As there is inadequate roads and access to this area, the surrounding streest will become "Rat" runs into the propsed area which will have an effect on the residents. The roads in cookridge were build in the late 50' & were not designed to accommodate the amount of traffic that will arise if these houses were allowed to be built. For every one house that is to be built equals two cars. Also there is a concern regarding flooding of this area. I would also like to comment that I cannot see how this would solve the housing problems but would only see taylor Winmpey shereholders would be the only ones to benefit. This area has been rejected on many occasions. Please look at redevelopment brown sites & leave all the Green Belts.

North Comments

Name: Tina Rowden

Representor No: PRS01106 Representation ID: REP03178

Question Ref: H1

1299A – BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated “GREEN” and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated “GREEN” and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Tina Rowden

Representor No: PRS01106 Representation ID: REP03178

Question Ref: H1

1178A - 1178A - 1.1178A and 1178B – DUNSTARN LANE
2.1033 – GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
3.1079, 1243 and 1246 – LONG CAUSEWAY
4.1299A and 1299B – BODINGTON HALL
5.2052 – TILE LANE
6.2130 – CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1.GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration – not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed.

NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless "very special circumstances" exist. However, the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A – which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of *Britton v SOS*, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

1.Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review,

North Comments

Name: Tina Rowden

Representor No: PRS01106 Representation ID: REP03178

together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as “RED” due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 – Protected Playing Pitch

2.site 1178A against other Green Belt sites – for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site 1178A objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation

I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear, defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2.SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) “...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement” and the definition of “sustainable development” in the CS as having “...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains...”

CS's Spatial Policy 6 “(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites”, (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation”

CS Policy H1: “sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation”

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 “...encourage the reuse of existing resources...”, NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 “contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...”, NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 “encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed”, NPPF para 38 “...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties”, NPPF para 51 “local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings” and NPPF para 111 “planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed”

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- 1.it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- 2.it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- 3.key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- 4.as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility (“poor public transport access”), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network – tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- 5.destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space
- 6.it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents
- 7.destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- 8.is in no way a sustainable development that has “minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain” – it will involve destruction of Green Belt and increased congestion and pollution from the vehicles of new residents and the only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s)

NPPF para 76 and 77 “Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used: (i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land”

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3.TRANSPORT

CS Policy H1: “sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility”

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport “New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network”

NPPF para 38 “...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties”

Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility (“poor public transport access”), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network – tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 “encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion”

North Comments

Name: Tina Rowden

Representor No: PRS01106 Representation ID: REP03178

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4.ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places"

NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- 1.destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- 2.destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- 3.only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions

CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- 1.whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- 2.the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- 3.on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity

In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Question Ref: H4

2130 – CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

1299B – BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Darren Rowden

Representor No: PRS01438 Representation ID: REP03568

Question Ref: H1

I have lived in Adel with my parents most of my life and they still live in Adel.

My main Concerns to land south of Dunstarn Lane :

The fields are attached to Adel woods and should be treated as part of the woods

Each year 100's of birds gather in field before they migrate.

Wild Deer, Foxes, Cranes, Bats, Newts and other rare animals come into the field to drink the water.

These animals should be left alone and kept undisturbed and no one should take away their natural habitat.

Under the field is a natural tarn. From which the Dunstarns got their name.

I feel it is about time that Leeds City council listened more to what people in the areas want, and not just go ahead and do what they want.

Traffic

Increase in traffic, you need to multiply the cars by at least 2 for every house that is planned to be built.

Increase of traffic on Long Causeway, which is already very congested in morning and evening rush hour.

Dunstarn lane is on a blind bend for pulling out.

The increase of cars would mean cars will queue all way up Long Causeway.

Also with the plan to build all other houses, Stairfoot lane will be made busier, and it is already an accident hot spot.

Alwoodley / Bramhope build will also increase traffic in Adel along Otley Road, and the Ring Road.

Traffic at the lights in Adel onto Otley Old Road already queues up and that is without taking into consideration of the new Centurian build.

And you're wanting more houses to be built!

Traffic pulling out onto Otley Road from ST. Helens Lane near the Esso garage is already a nightmare to pull out, especially now the speed limit has been reduced to 30mph.

I would suggest that you drive to these junctions in Adel and try and pull out safely yourself.

All that is going to happen is more accidents, possible fatal.

Adel is a nice peaceful place to live and more people and traffic is complete madness.

Outside the primary school on Long Causeway is chaotic when children are being dropped off in the morning and picked up in the afternoon with parked cars down the street made even worse with someone's bright idea to close the very small car park next to the school.

Doctors

The doctor's surgery, you can't even get an appointment now, never mind all these hundreds more people.

Public Transport

Don't think by putting more buses in the area will help as most people don't use them now and will not use them in the future.

New Built Houses

The population is not as high as people had originally been led to believe so we don't need all these proposed new houses.

Also I feel these new build properties look a complete eye sore, they are not in keeping with the area, I don't want you thinking they have improved the area, they are small and too close together. The only people that are going to gain are the builders building standard houses at a high price.

You are also going to bring all the house prices down in the area. What you should do is compensate all for the money they will lose.

I am sure you will be taken to task for this when there is a loop hole found in the future. People in Adel have spent their lives saving and paying taxes to live in a nice area. All you are doing is making the local residents feel that if building goes ahead they will have to move. It's a joke!

Summary

The Dunstarns are one of the nicest natural places left in Adel and Leeds, so should be kept like this and not ruined as I said previously, it is part of the Adel woods and should be left well alone for people and wild life to enjoy.

I feel that these issues should be said how it is, as people may be too nice and polite to say what they feel.

I will look forward to your response to this letter not just thrown in the bin.

North Comments

Name: A Rowden

Representor No: PRS01661 Representation ID: REP03817

Question Ref: H1

1178A -
POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES IN ADEL
LAND SOUTH OF DUNSTARN LANE ADEL

We would like to object to the Councils designation of the above site which you have colour coded green as it is a green belt site and we feel it should be kept as a green belt site as it is part of the Meanwood Valley Corridor. It is also home to a large variety of wildlife.

We feel that existing brown sites should be considered for use before taking green belt land.

(1) Adel does not have a suitable road infrastructure to cope with additional housing. At peak times Dunstarn Drive and Dunstarn Lane would become a race track as cars who could not get out of the proposed site entrance onto Long Causeway would then use Dunstarn Drive instead. The increase in cars of about 120 approximately from the above proposed site would add to the traffic problems on surrounding roads particularly at peak times.

(2) Existing schools are full in this area and are not big enough to take any more children.

(3) Existing Doctors surgery on Long Causeway would be unable to cope with any more patients, and even now appointments can be difficult to make.

(4) Public transport would not be able to cope with a large increase in local population

(5) Leeds population is not currently growing at the rate expected so why build houses that are not required?

(6) The only shop in this part of Adel is a small store on St Martins Drive which due to its size only holds a small stock of produce.

(7) Local job prospects, where will people find jobs as there are very few now.

(8) Since living here we have noticed after heavy rain and snow the field becomes waterlogged and flooded areas of water take a long time to drain away, this has been particularly noticed this spring.

(9) Any new build on land south of Dunstarn Lane would not be on any building line, and would also be over developing the area.

(10) Existing Dunstarn properties are all individually designed and built, no two houses are the same so appearance wise any future development would need to follow suit, and potentially very costly to any builder.

(11) We are very concerned about the access issues for any proposed building on the above site.

(12) Any new build would have a drastic impact as it seems they are built so close together as at Centurian Fields site.

There are already houses being built in this area at Centirion Field site and a couple of future proposed developments on the Bodington Hall site and the Government Buildings site, surely these should be adequate for the new properties required for this area.

Question Ref: H4

2130 — CHURCH LANE ADEL

This was a Protected Area of Search site and has been changed to colour code amber we feel this should be reverted back to Protected Area of Search due to its heritage and historical value.

North Comments

Name: Adrian Rowden

Representor No: PRS06543 Representation ID: REP02105

Question Ref: H1

I lived with my parents in Dunstarn Lane over twelve years ago.

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES IN ADEL. SITE REF No. 1178A— LAND SOUTH OF DUNSTARN LANE ADEL

I would like to object to the Councils designation of the above site which you have colour coded green as it is a green belt site and I feel it should be kept as a green belt site as it is part of the Meanwood Valley Corridor. It is also home to a large variety of wildlife.

I feel that existing brown sites should be considered for use before taking green belt land.

(1) Adel does not have a suitable road infrastructure to cope with additional housing. At peak times Dunstarn Drive and Dunstarn Lane would become a race track as cars who could not get out of the proposed site entrance onto Long Causeway would then use Dunstarn Drive instead. The increase in cars of about 120 approximately from the above proposed site would add to the traffic problems on surrounding roads particularly at peak times.

(2) Existing schools are full in this area and are not big enough to take any more children.

(3) Existing Doctors surgery on Long Causeway would be unable to cope with any more patients, and even now appointments can be difficult to make.

(4) Public transport would not be able to cope with a large increase in local population.

(5) Leeds population is not currently growing at the rate expected so why build houses that are not required?

(6) The only shop in this part of Adel is a small store on Sir George Martin Drive which due to its size only holds a small stock of produce.

(7) Local job prospects, where will people find jobs as there are very few now.

(8) Since living here I have noticed after heavy rain and snow the field becomes waterlogged and flooded areas of water take a long time to drain away, this has been particularly noticed this spring.

(9) Any new build on land south of Dunstarn Lane would not be on any building line, and would also be over developing the area.

(10) Existing Dunstarn properties are all individually designed and built, no two houses are the same so appearance wise any future development would need to follow suit, and potentially very costly to any builder.

(11) I am very concerned about the access issues for any proposed building on the above site.

(12) Any new build would have a drastic impact as it seems they are built so close together as at Centurian Fields site.

There are already houses being built in this area at Centirion Field site and a couple of future proposed developments on the Bodington Hall site and the Government Buildings site, surely these should be adequate for the new properties required for this area.

Question Ref: H4

SITE REF NO.2130 — CHURCH LANE ADEL

This was a Protected Area of Search site and has been changed to colour code amber I feel this should be reverted back to Protected Area of Search due to its heritage and historical value.

North Comments

Name: J.m Rowland

Representor No: PRS01231 Representation ID: REP03335

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Roads will be more congested at rush hour - especially otley old road, otley road etc. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Other facilities too are already insufficient for people's need. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Insurance will be unaffordable, area has many springs. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Wildlife has already begun to decline owing to the paving of gardens so propped development would be catastrophic

North Comments

Name: Jim Rowland

Representor No: PRS01234 Representation ID: REP03336

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Agree. No room without taking out green sites. We need green sites. Facilities enadequate for expansion. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Houses further up hill are creating excessive run off. The area is wet and some houses have water ponding underneath them at times. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. As this area is squeezed it will not be able to sustain its present diverse fauna.

North Comments

Name: Frances Rowland

Representor No: PRS01235 **Representation ID:** REP03339

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Agree. We need more houses but brownfield sites should be used first. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Richard Rowley

Representor No: PRS01442 **Representation ID:** REP03573

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. Would put too much pressure on the infrastructure, roads, schools and shops. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Green lane already busy - 200 more houses would create potentially 400 more cars in the local area. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Unless preventative measures are taken the inevitable surface run-off from new development could create flooding. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. New development would be bound to increase pressure on wildlife.

North Comments

Name: Stephanie Rowson

Representor No: PRS03143 Representation ID: REP00807

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I cannot anticipate any specific problems with building houses on the identified green sites.

Question Ref: H2

1202 - I am concerned about the impact building on this site will have on traffic congestion, particularly on the roundabout where the A65 meets the ring road. This roundabout is already extremely busy, to the extent that I have to travel through it at 7.20 each morning (to get to my workplace in bingley) despite it only being a 30 minute journey and me not starting work till 8.15. Additional traffic would also impact on the calverley/rodley roundabout, and lead to more congestion in greengates and Shipley. I have already been involved in a collision at the former roundabout where a stressed out mum was trying to navigate the roundabout whilst I was stationary, queuing. I would hate to think how the number of accidents would escalate with even more traffic. For proof, I would encourage any member of your team to visit the area at half 8 during a school morning!

Question Ref: H3

N/a

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Please see previous comment re site 1202. Not able to comment on the others.

Question Ref: H5

1202: Traffic congestion and potential impact on local schools that are already massively over subscribed

Question Ref: H6

N/a

Question Ref: H7

y

North Comments

Name: Rubber Enterprises Limited

Representor No: PRS06018 **Representation ID:** REP06847

Question Ref: H3

1062 - object to amber. Should be green

H3: Yes. We consider site reference 1062 should be green for the following reasons:

1. Site reference 1062 comprises a brownfield site, the former Horsforth Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW). The site is currently colour coded amber and the local planning authority's own assessment confirms that its redevelopment is considered to be appropriate. It is a sustainable and deliverable site which should be coloured green to reflect its potential to deliver a mix of housing at an early date to meet the residual target identified for the area. The local planning authority's assessment also states that the site is well contained by strong boundaries.
2. The site lies within the Main Urban Area and defined by the submission Core Strategy. While that document is subject to examination and quantum of development across the City therefore remain to be determined as acknowledged in the Site Allocations Issues and Options documents, it would seem reasonable to assume that in accordance with national planning policy, it is the Main Urban Area which will be the main focus for all forms of development. Consequently, a reasonable presumption is that appropriate development opportunities within the defined Main Urban Area, particularly where they are capable of being brought forward in the short term in the situation of the need for delivery of new housing, that these opportunities should be taken where the local planning authority consider that development is appropriate.
3. Moreover, and again as indicated in the submission Core Strategy, delivery within the Main Urban Area is an essential element of the overall strategy being promoted by the local planning authority and that failure to deliver adequate housing within the Main Urban Area will have consequences for the pattern of development which will be contrary to those overall objectives. Once again, and in accordance with national planning policy, development where possible and appropriate within and closely related to the Main Urban Areas will represent the most sustainable patterns of development and so are to be encouraged.
4. The site adjoins the Kirkstall Forge Site to the east which the site assessments state has the benefit of planning permission for 1385 residential units, retail and employment uses and is to provide a new railway station. This committed development adjoins the south east and south west boundaries, beyond the wooded banks of the River Aire in the latter case. The north west boundary is well wooded with established residential beyond. The north eastern boundary is formed by the A65, again with established residential areas beyond.
5. The site is a sustainable site with good linkages to the existing services and the wider urban area. It lies on the Kirkstall Road Express Bus Corridor. The Kirkstall Forge rail halt will enhance links to both Leeds and Bradford city centres as well as a range of other centres and to connections beyond. The bus routes provide good access to the major facilities at Kirkstall town centre and to New Road Side local centre and to the City Centre.
6. The location is also easily accessible by existing public transport for employment locations along the Aire Valley and into the City Centre. The Kirkstall Forge employment development will be an additional opportunity for working locally without a need for vehicular commuting trips.
7. The sustainability and general accessibility of the site is confirmed in the published site assessment which proposes that the site may be suitable for education use.
8. There are no rights of public access although trespass does occur. Boundary vegetation and important trees can be mainly retained but the main extent of the site with the cleared areas of the former treatment tanks is easily capable of accommodating residential development.
9. The site is available now and is able to accommodate residential development which will address general housing needs and any specific to this part of the City in the short term, certainly 0-5 years. The site assessments suggest that other amber sites in this part of the City face constraints which might delay or preclude delivery. Consequently it is considered that this site should be shown as green and allocated for development for housing in the short term.

North Comments

Name: Rubber Enterprises Limited

Representor No: PRS06018 Representation ID: REP06847

Question Ref: H4

1062

H4: if not identified as green, site reference 1062 is clearly an appropriate amber site for the same reasons copied below for ease of reference.

1. Site reference 1062 comprises a brownfield site, the former Horsforth Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW). The site is currently colour coded amber and the local planning authority's own assessment confirms that its redevelopment is considered to be appropriate. It is a sustainable and deliverable site which should be coloured green to reflect its potential to deliver a mix of housing at an early date to meet the residual target identified for the area. The local planning authority's assessment also states that the site is well contained by strong boundaries.
2. The site lies within the Main Urban Area and defined by the submission Core Strategy. While that document is subject to examination and quantum of development across the City therefore remain to be determined as acknowledged in the Site Allocations Issues and Options documents, it would seem reasonable to assume that in accordance with national planning policy, it is the Main Urban Area which will be the main focus for all forms of development. Consequently, a reasonable presumption is that appropriate development opportunities within the defined Main Urban Area, particularly where they are capable of being brought forward in the short term in the situation of the need for delivery of new housing, that these opportunities should be taken where the local planning authority consider that development is appropriate.
3. Moreover, and again as indicated in the submission Core Strategy, delivery within the Main Urban Area is an essential element of the overall strategy being promoted by the local planning authority and that failure to deliver adequate housing within the Main Urban Area will have consequences for the pattern of development which will be contrary to those overall objectives. Once again, and in accordance with national planning policy, development where possible and appropriate within and closely related to the Main Urban Areas will represent the most sustainable patterns of development and so are to be encouraged.
4. The site adjoins the Kirkstall Forge Site to the east which the site assessments state has the benefit of planning permission for 1385 residential units, retail and employment uses and is to provide a new railway station. This committed development adjoins the south east and south west boundaries, beyond the wooded banks of the River Aire in the latter case. The north west boundary is well wooded with established residential beyond. The north eastern boundary is formed by the A65, again with established residential areas beyond.
5. The site is a sustainable site with good linkages to the existing services and the wider urban area. It lies on the Kirkstall Road Express Bus Corridor. The Kirkstall Forge rail halt will enhance links to both Leeds and Bradford city centres as well as a range of other centres and to connections beyond. The bus routes provide good access to the major facilities at Kirkstall town centre and to New Road Side local centre and to the City Centre.
6. The location is also easily accessible by existing public transport for employment locations along the Aire Valley and into the City Centre. The Kirkstall Forge employment development will be an additional opportunity for working locally without a need for vehicular commuting trips.
7. The sustainability and general accessibility of the site is confirmed in the published site assessment which proposes that the site may be suitable for education use.
8. There are no rights of public access although trespass does occur. Boundary vegetation and important trees can be mainly retained but the main extent of the site with the cleared areas of the former treatment tanks is easily capable of accommodating residential development.
9. The site is available now and is able to accommodate residential development which will address general housing needs and any specific to this part of the City in the short term, certainly 0-5 years. The site assessments suggest that other amber sites in this part of the City face constraints which might delay or preclude delivery. Consequently it is considered that this site should be shown as green and allocated for development for housing in the short term.

North Comments

Name: Gwendoline Ruddy

Representor No: PRS01493 Representation ID: REP03632

Question Ref: H1

I am writing to say that I agree absolutely with the Council Officers' decision regarding SHLAA reference 1015 Hunger Hills being unsuitable for development (site capacity 791 properties) This area is a beautiful green open space, readily available to the great number of people who live in the surrounding built-up areas.

The woods within the Hunger Hills area (SHLAA reference 1015) have large numbers and a great variety of trees, notably the ancient stands of purposely planted beeches. These woods are home to numerous species of birds and animals, and they are well-known as being the beautiful "Bluebell Woods" in springtime. The fields are an annual 'stopping-off' place for migrating birds, notably redwings.

This has long been a very popular recreational area. Our children and now our grandchildren have loved the freedom of being in the woods and fields (whether playing or exercising pets in the summer or sledging in the winter) Indeed, it is very rare for us to look out over the area without seeing walkers, dog walkers, runners, bikers or horse riders going along the paths through the trees.

The area is surrounded by an already extremely busy and sometimes quite hazardous network of roads. Indeed, only yesterday there was another quite serious collision at the crossroads at the top of West End Lane. West End Lane (having at least 2 sharp bends and being a busy school route) is notorious for being a speedy 'rat run' down to the A65 at busy times of the day.

- Westbrook Lane - Lee Lane East has already been created a one-way road to cope safely with the volume of traffic which uses it.

It is difficult to think how development here could safely cope with the increased volume of traffic it would entail.

This area of tranquillity, peace and fresh air with glorious views is a most valuable asset for the many people of the surrounding district.

I am convinced that other sites for necessary development are far more appropriate than this one, and would like to reiterate that I believe the Council Officers' decision that it is "unsuitable for development" is the correct one.

North Comments

Name: James Ruddy

Representor No: PRS06017 Representation ID: REP06845

Question Ref: H7

Site Allocation Consultation, SHLAA reference 1015 Hunger Hills:

Dear Sirs,

This is to confirm that I believe that the council officers' decision that SHLAA reference 1015 is 'unsuitable for development' is the correct one.

The area is surrounded by housing and the effect on the present residents in this area of Horsforth would be significant.

It is difficult to imagine the existing infrastructure coping with the amount of development initially contemplated. We understand that schools, doctors' surgeries and the like are already stretched.

The surrounding road network is already extremely busy – West End Lane has become a very speedy and somewhat dangerous cut through from Bayton Lane to and from the A65 at peak times.

Westbook Lane/Lee Lane East is already a one-way route to cope with the traffic situation. Without additional roads and routes it is difficult to see how the existing network could cope.

I feel it would be criminal to build on land that is seen locally as being of great natural beauty enjoyed by people of all ages.

Incidentally, we have discovered that a high pressure gas main [EAST BIERLEY – PANNAL (14-15) 38 BAR] passes through the fields on the east side of Lee Lane West.

I'm not sure if this would have any relevance to future planning decisions.

[x]

North Comments

Name: Sue Rugg

Representor No: PRS03818 Representation ID: REP02037

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Bramhope area already over populated for a village, with insufficient facilities (school and doctors) and a busy local highway network A660.

Question Ref: H2

364

Question Ref: H3

N/A

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Site 3367A and 1080 - both sites would dramatically increase the amount of traffic on to the highways network, road A660, making the road more dangerous than it already is. Also the loss of green belt to the area and impact on local wildlife. Site 1005 - Building on green belt. Site 3400 - Building on green belt. Generally to all three amber coded site (3367A/1080/1005/3400):- Transforming a village into a town by increasing the population by 30%- impact on the local highway network A660- Lack of public transport into the area- Loss of green belt- Amount of urban sprawl is unacceptable- Lack of facilities in the village (education and doctors)

Question Ref: H5

Site 3367A and 1080 - both sites would dramatically increase the amount of traffic on to the highways network, road A660, making the road more dangerous than it already is. Also the loss of green belt to the area and impact on local wildlife. Site 1005 - Building on green belt. Site 3400 - Building on green belt. Generally to all three amber coded site (3367A/1080/1005/3400):- Transforming a village into a town by increasing the population by 30%- impact on the local highway network A660- Lack of public transport into the area- Loss of green belt- Amount of urban sprawl is unacceptable- Lack of facilities in the village (education and doctors)

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Site 2051A in Alwoodley - Large site, which has suitable access on to a main road, Alwoodley is not classed as a village and has suitable facilities and transport for commuters

Question Ref: H8

2051A - Large site, which has suitable access on to a main road, Alwoodley is not classed as a village and has suitable facilities and transport for commuters

Question Ref: H9

No

Question Ref: H10

No

Question Ref: H11

No

Question Ref: H12

No

Question Ref: H13

No

Question Ref: H14

No

Question Ref: H15

No

North Comments

Name: Sue Rugg

Representor No: PRS03818 **Representation ID:** REP02037

Question Ref: General comment

Green belt land is something that we (Leeds City Council) cannot take back once built upon. Has the council considered their empty homes policy and how the requirement for additional accommodation can be fulfilled in this way rather than building on limited green space areas. Leeds City Council granted Bramhope Conservation Status last year and now less than a year later wish to take away from the village feel by increasing the urban sprawl. An unacceptable way to develop housing.

North Comments

Name: Christopher Rushforth

Representor No: PRS03238 Representation ID: REP01545

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I can understand most of the reasons put forward for the use of the green sites. These involve quite a lot of green belt, but in my opinion they are closer to Leeds and as such would not add to the traffic congestion until we get further down the A65

Question Ref: H3

2038 is coded amber, but is Brownfield. The fact that it would require remedial works before a residential use could be considered should not make so much difference. Surely the profit margins of the builders aren't the issue here. Brownfield should be considered before any scrap of greenbelt is used. After all Brownfield has already been developed, but once built on you will never get green belt back.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: H6

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H8

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H9

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

North Comments

Name: Christopher Rushforth

Representor No: PRS03238 **Representation ID:** REP01545

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area. I have submitted them as my own, as I agree with them entirely. [x]

North Comments

Name: John Rush

Representor No: PRS00634 Representation ID: REP02619

Question Ref: G17

2055 Having been a plot holder on our site for 50 years, and secretary for many years there have been many changes and improvements to the site due to hard work done by members. Over the years it has been a great asset to the locality, giving enjoyment, exercise and provided healthy food for the families. There has been continuous publicity on T/V, radio and newspapers regarding the shortage of allotments, and encouraging people to grow their own healthy food, and this has caused an increase in demand for plots, and long waiting lists.

This suggestion of building houses on the Carr Manor allotment site seem to be a complete contradiction to what we are given to understand as to the importance of allotments. Why should such a well used site be sacrificed when there are GREEN FIELD SITES that could be used for building houses? And why is there such a short time available to discuss the matter?

North Comments

Name: Sarah Rushton

Representor No: PRS04604 **Representation ID:** REP02051

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

The sites at Boddington Hall and the Government Buildings on the Otley Road in Adel are appropriate sites for housing development. They are both brownfield sites. However, note should be taken that the Government buildings had trees on that were felled.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Site 2130 lies on the northern edge of Adel village. It lies opposite St John's church in Adel, one of the oldest buildings in Leeds. The setting of this Listed church includes the land encompassed by Site 2130. Indeed, there is an ancient footpath directly opposite the Church on Church Lane that is associated with the Church and its use. Whilst the site has been taken out of the Green Belt, this does not mean that it has no value particularly from an historic point of view. Adel has had significant levels of development currently in progress, and planned for the next few years. This includes the field to the south of site 2130 but also the brownfield sites of Boddington Hall and the Government Offices. Taken in combination, this is a significant increase in population for a relatively small settlement within the Leeds area. Furthermore, Adel schools do not have any capacity. Residents of Adel are having to travel outside Adel to take their children to school - to Cookridge, further into Leeds and even settlements such as Poole. With the additional pressure resulting from the significant developments already taking place in the area, further high levels of development would not be a sustainable form of development.

Question Ref: H5

Site 2130 lies on the northern edge of Adel village. It lies opposite St John's church in Adel, one of the oldest buildings in Leeds. The setting of this Listed church includes the land encompassed by Site 2130. Indeed, there is an ancient footpath directly opposite the Church on Church Lane that is associated with the Church and its use. Whilst the site has been taken out of the Green Belt, this does not mean that it has no value particularly from an historic point of view. Adel has had significant levels of development currently in progress, and planned for the next few years. This includes the field to the south of site 2130 but also the brownfield sites of Boddington Hall and the Government Offices. Taken in combination, this is a significant increase in population for a relatively small settlement within the Leeds area. Furthermore, Adel schools do not have any capacity. Residents of Adel are having to travel outside Adel to take their children to school - to Cookridge, further into Leeds and even settlements such as Poole. With the additional pressure resulting from the significant developments already taking place in the area, further high levels of development would not be a sustainable form of development.

Question Ref: H7

n

North Comments

Name: Jane Rushworth

Representor No: PRS02008 **Representation ID:** REP04205

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly Agree One of the reasons the majority of people chose to live in cookridge is because of the green belt and the fact that we have all this green space on our doorstep. This development will change this. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly Agree Parking around schools/shops is already a massive issue. An additional 300 plus cars will only make this situation worse. There are only two routes out of Cookridge towards the city centre which cannot take this additional pressure. The alternative would be the train but the service cannot cope with the existing demand. with many people not being able to get on the train at Horsforth. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly Agree The local schools are under pressure to accommodate the existing children. Our local doctor is increasingly busy making the wait for appointments too long. Further housed will only make this worse. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Strongly Agree A number of Cookridge residents have already at personal expense had to have some type of drainage installed in their garden. More building will only make the problem worse. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly Agree Same reasons as question 1.

North Comments

Name: Rosalind Russell

Representor No: PRS03539 Representation ID: REP01518

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I can understand most of the reasons put forward for the use of the green sites. These involve quite a lot of green belt, but in my opinion they are closer to Leeds and as such would not add to the traffic congestion until we get further down the A65

Question Ref: H3

2038 is coded amber, but is Brownfield. The fact that it would require remedial works before a residential use could be considered should not make so much difference. Surely the profit margins of the builders aren't the issue here. Brownfield should be considered before any scrap of greenbelt is used. After all Brownfield has already been developed, but once built on you will never get green belt back.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: H6

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H8

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H9

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

North Comments

Name: Rosalind Russell

Representor No: PRS03539 **Representation ID:** REP01518

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area. I have submitted them as my own, as I agree with them entirely. [x]

North Comments

Name: Martin Russell

Representor No: PRS04300 Representation ID: REP01522

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I can understand most of the reasons put forward for the use of the green sites. These involve quite a lot of green belt, but in my opinion they are closer to Leeds and as such would not add to the traffic congestion until we get further down the A65

Question Ref: H3

2038 is coded amber, but is Brownfield. The fact that it would require remedial works before a residential use could be considered should not make so much difference. Surely the profit margins of the builders aren't the issue here. Brownfield should be considered before any scrap of greenbelt is used. After all Brownfield has already been developed, but once built on you will never get green belt back.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: H6

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H8

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H9

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

North Comments

Name: Martin Russell

Representor No: PRS04300 **Representation ID:** REP01522

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area. I have submitted them as my own, as I agree with them entirely. [x]

North Comments

Name: Jim Ryan

Representor No: PRS01090 Representation ID: REP03159

Question Ref: H7

2160 & 2046 - With reference to sites 2160 Ling Bob and 2046 North Ives Farm.
I wish to state that I feel that these sites are not considered suitable for housing.
They should remain as green field sites

North Comments

Name: Jim Ryan

Representor No: PRS01090 Representation ID: REP07220

Question Ref: H7

With reference to sites 2160 Ling Bob and 2046 North Ives Farm.
I wish to state that I feel that these sites are not considered suitable for housing.
They should remain as green field sites

North Comments

Name: Jean Ryan

Representor No: PRS05732 **Representation ID:** REP06403

Question Ref: H7

With reference to the 2 large sites 2160 Ling Bob and 2046 North Ives Farm, I agree that these 2 sites are NOT considered suitable allocation for housing. It is most important that these areas are preserved as green fields.

North Comments

Name: S. W. Fraser Trustees C/o Smiths Gore

Representor No: PRS06077 **Representation ID:** REP06931

Question Ref: H4

See representation submitted for full details and site plans.

Site Ref: 1016 – Land at Broadway and Calverley Lane, Horsforth

The site is currently identified as 'amber' in the consultation document. It is situated within a sustainable location, located within the built up area of Horsforth which forms part of the main urban area of Leeds. The site in question is approximately 0.5 hectares and is currently vacant. Please see the attached plan for further detail. Access is available directly from Calverley Lane and the site is supported for development by the Council's Highways Offices for approximately 13 dwellings. We note that 'Site Allocations Plan Volume 2: 5 North' set out on page 11 that Highways have concerns regarding local traffic congestion if Site 1016 was developed, however, the site proforma states that that this would only be a concern to the Highways Officers if development was to exceed 13 units. Based on the size of the site and on an average density of 30 dwellings per hectare, our client would not be looking to bring the site forward for more than 13 dwellings. This concern should therefore be removed from the assessment and on this basis that site should be reassessed as 'green'.

The site is flat in topography and is considered wholly developable. The developable area is therefore considered to be approximately 0.5 hectares. It is therefore considered that this site, in its sustainable location, should be released for housing development. The site boundary is well defined and is surrounded by predominantly established residential development. The site's development for up to 13 dwellings would serve to round off the settlement and establish a firm boundary.

There are a few trees / shrubs located along the boundary of the site, however, not significant enough to have an adverse impact on the future development of the site. Any proposed development, however, would include the necessary arboricultural surveys and aim to retain as many trees as possible. The site is within a Conservation Area and this would be taken into consideration with regard to any future development to ensure that what is delivered would reflect the urban grain and enhance the overall design quality of the surrounding area. Although the site is within the Conservation Area, this should not be a reason to preclude development and any future planning application would serve to appropriately control the quality of design.

We consider there to be limited ecology restrictions to prevent the delivery of the site for housing. In addition, the West Yorkshire Ecology and Leeds City Council Ecology Officer support the site coming forward for development and consider the site of low ecological value. Again, however, any planning application would be supported by the necessary ecology reports to enable the local planning authority to determine the outcome of an application in a detailed manner.

Due to the site being within the built up environment of Horsforth, the site is in close proximity to a wide range of local services and facilities.

These include shops, restaurants, churches, sports facilities, school and open space. The site is also in close proximity to bus stops and regular bus services and Horsforth Train Station. The site is therefore considered to not only have good access to the local highways, but also to public transport. It is therefore considered that the site is a robust site to come forward for residential development during the plan period. Furthermore, our clients land is not within an area of high flood risk (please see the attached Environment Agency plan for reference); the site is not within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or national nature conservation designation and, is not within a minerals safeguarded site or within the airport safety zone.

Based on the above - and as the site falls within the settlement hierarchy of the Core Strategy - Leeds City Council should consider the site as a suitable, available, achievable and deliverable site to accommodate future housing growth in the North Leeds Area. The future development of the site would create an attractive, vibrant and successful place, promoting a long term sustainable community and delivering quality housing in an area of high market demand. Additional housing choice in the area is considered to be a benefit to local communities and to the district as a whole; helping meet the local housing needs and demands during the plan period. The scale of development in the area is not considered to be detrimental to the existing infrastructure and landscape and relevant supporting document would be used to support a future planning application in due course to back this up, if deemed necessary by the planning authority.

The only limitation to bringing the site forward for development in the short term is its location within the Green Belt. The land is Green Belt but has strong links to the urban area and is well contained eliminating potential for future urban sprawl. It is considered that this site does not add to the Green Belt or comply with the 5 purposes identified in the NPPF for identifying land to be designated as Green Belt. Development of the site would not lead to the unrestricted sprawl of large built up area based on the natural boundaries of the site (please see above for further detail). The development of the site would not lead to neighboring towns merging together. The site is not valuable countryside or utilised agricultural land. The site does not preserve the setting and special character of a historic town and, finally, the development of the site would help address the housing need and demand in the area without having an adverse impact on urban regeneration as the site is not located in close proximity to a major regeneration area.

Although the site was identified in the Sustainability Assessment as having an adverse impact on greenfield land and is considered to add to pollution in the area (Objectives 11 and 18) these objectives affect the majority of sites put forward for development during this plan period. This should not be a reason for refusing the identification of Site 1016 as an acceptable site for residential development.

Notwithstanding the site's Green Belt allocation, the site is well connected to the urban area and contained by existing defined boundaries and the land is a sustainable, deliverable site for future residential development and its delivery would not have a significant detrimental impact on the local environment. Our client wishes to bring the site forward for development. We therefore urge the Council to reassess the land and identify the site to be a 'green', suitable site to accommodate future residential development.

We acknowledge that phasing of sites will take place at a later stage of the plan; however, it is considered that Sites 1014 and 1016 are available for short to medium term development, with Site 1015 being phased throughout the plan period.

Safeguarding Land

There is also the need to safeguard land for future development. It is vital that the council provides sufficient land for long term development to ensure long term endurance of the Green Belt boundaries and provide a reserve of potential sites for longer term development needs beyond the plan period. This is in line with Policy SP10 of the Core Strategy. If the Council can not support the future development of all our clients land for development during this plan period, we would urge that all of the relevant sites above be removed from the Green Belt for short – medium term development or, safeguarded for future development post plan period.

Conclusion

All (or part of) our client's landholding is available, suitable and deliverable for residential development over the plan period and should be considered as part of a robust Green Belt Review. Our client's sites (please see attached plans for reference) would represent appropriate and well contained development sites in Horsforth. They are of no special character and can be developed in keeping with surrounding properties and will be a particular enhancement of the Conservation Area, where appropriate. The sites are all ideally placed to provide the flexible and continuous supply of housing land that national and local guidance requires. Our clients, the S. W. Fraser Trustees, would like to work closely and in partnership with the Council to support and help deliver sustainable growth in North Leeds. It is considered that the land identified on the attached plans should be allocated for residential development or at least safeguarded for future development and therefore removed from the Green Belt designation.

North Comments

Name: S. W. Fraser Trustees C/o Smiths Gore

Representor No: PRS06077 **Representation ID:** REP06931

Question Ref: H7

See representation submitted for full details and site plans.

The North Leeds area is characterised by a number of distinctive communities forming part of the main suburban area of Leeds. As set out above, our clients' land is located immediately adjacent to the built up area of Leeds, within the Horsforth area. Please see the attached location plans for reference. Horsforth is an affluent community with a range of services and facilities, including a rail service direct to Leeds and Harrogate. The settlement is therefore well placed to accommodate an additional level of housing growth. We propose that residential development of our clients sites would facilitate the delivery of necessary new housing in a sustainable location, to meet the Council's housing target over the plan period (3,035 unit residual target for the North Leeds area after the deduction of existing supply (both allocations and permissions) which equates to approximately 202 new dwellings per annum).

Site Assessment

The majority of our clients land is currently identified as Green Belt. However, we strongly believe that the sites identified on the attached plans are wholly suitable for removal from the Green Belt as part of the Council's review and future allocation for housing. When considered against a number of other sites within the Green Belt, we believe that our clients land will score highly against the principles of sustainable development and their suitability and deliverability. Our basis for this is set out below.

Site appraisals

Site Ref: 1014 – Land at Fraser Avenue, Horsforth

The site is situated within a sustainable location in the built up area of Horsforth, which forms part of the main urban area of Leeds. Access is available directly from Fraser Avenue. The site is supported for development by the Council's Highways Officers, as long as any potential impacts and mitigation measures are closely assessed to ensure a reasonable solution. Our clients would be willing to undertake a robust highways assessment to identify whether there is any issue in relation to delivering a highways solution for any future development, if deemed necessary by the Council. The site in question is approximately 1.2 hectares (please see the attached plan for further detail). Based on an average density of 30 dwellings per hectare, it is considered that the site is able to adequately accommodate around 35 dwellings (although we note that the site proforma, prepared as part of the consultation, indicates that the site could accommodate 45 dwellings). The above numbers do not take into account any potential design constraints, open space requirements, or buffer areas etc. Final numbers would therefore be discussed in greater detail with the Council during the preparation of any future planning application.

The existing land use of the site is for grazing, however, we note that it is identified as 'potential' open space in the UDP. Notwithstanding this, the 'Site Allocations Plan Volume 2: 5 North' document (page 30) acknowledges that the existing UDP Policy N5 (proposed Green Space) designation at Fraser Avenue was not identified as being in green space use in the Open Space Audit and has clearly not been delivered through Policy N5. The Council should therefore delete the green space allocation and, given the site's sustainable location, release the land for housing development.

The site is generally flat in topography with a slight slope and is considered wholly suitable for high quality new housing development to reflect the existing urban grain and enhance the local area. The developable area is believed to be approximately 1.2 hectares. However, we would be willing to discuss an exact site boundary in greater detail with the council, in due course. The site boundary is well defined and is surrounded by the built up environment, particularly residential development. There are also a few trees / shrubs located within the site. As there is limited tree coverage on the site, future development is not likely to have any adverse arboricultural impacts. Any proposed development, however, would include the necessary arboricultural surveys and aim to retain as many trees as possible.

The site is within a Conservation Area and the design quality and features of the surrounding area would be taken into careful consideration with regard to any future development to ensure an overall enhancement of the Conservation Area. Given the limited level of planting and trees on the site, there is unlikely to be any critical ecology restrictions to impede future residential development. Again, however, any future planning application would be supported by the necessary ecology reports to enable the local planning authority to determine the outcome of an application with a detailed overview of the ecology impacts of the proposed development.

The land is within the built up area of the town of Horsforth, in close proximity to a wide range of local services and facilities. These include shops, restaurants, churches, sports facilities, open space provision and a range of schools. The site is also in close proximity to bus stops with regular bus services and Horsforth Train Station, with direct access to Leeds and Harrogate. The site is therefore considered to have excellent access to local facilities, the local highway network, and public transport provision. On this basis, we propose that the site is sufficiently robust to be delivered for residential development during the plan period. Furthermore, our clients land is not within an area of high flood risk (please see the attached Environment Agency plan for reference); is not within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or national nature conservation designation and is not within a minerals safeguarded site or within the airport safety zone. Based on the above, and as the site falls within the settlement hierarchy of the Core Strategy, Leeds City Council should consider the site as a suitable, available, achievable and deliverable site to accommodate future housing growth in the North Leeds Area. The future development of the site would create an attractive, vibrant and successful place, promoting a long term sustainable community and delivering quality housing in an area of high market demand. Additional housing choice in the area is considered to be a benefit to local communities and to the district as a whole; helping meet the local housing needs and demands during the plan period.

The scale of development in the area is not considered to be detrimental to the existing infrastructure and landscape and relevant supporting documents would be used to support a future planning application, in due course, if deemed necessary by the local planning authority. The scoring in the Sustainability Appraisal states that there is a negative scoring based on Objective 10 which focuses on the 'quality, quantity and accessibility of open space'. Although we acknowledge that development of this site would result in the loss of 'proposed open space', the site was never implemented as such use during the period of the UDP and is therefore considered surplus to requirements in this area. This scoring is therefore considered to be flawed and its former 'proposed' use should not have an adverse impact on the overall grading / scoring of the site.

In respect of Objective 11 and the impact on Greenfield land, and Objective 18 which refers to reduction in pollution, these objectives affect the majority of sites put forward for development during this plan period. Again this should not be a reason for refusing the identification of Site 1014 as an acceptable site for residential development. The site should therefore be amended to 'Green' in the SHLAA and Site Allocations Plan. There are no tenants on the site or any buildings which would require clearing or demolition. It is therefore available in the short to medium term allocation and would generate significant market interest.

The S. W. Fraser Trustees would like to work closely and in partnership with the Council to support and help deliver sustainable growth in North Leeds, including the future development of Site 1014.

Site Ref: 1015 – Land south of Lee Lane West, Horsforth,

Our client's site, 1015, is situated within a sustainable location adjacent to the built up area of Horsforth. Access is readily available directly off a number of local roads. The existing land use of the site is for agriculture / grazing and is approximately 30 hectares. If necessary, however, the land could be considered as three separate parcels. Parcel 1, to the west of the site, is circa 17.0 hectares, parcel 2 to the north of the entire site, is circa 8.5 hectares and, parcel 3, south east of parcel 1, is circa 3.7 hectares. Please see the attached plan for further detail.

Based on an average density of 30 dwellings per hectare, it is considered that the site as a whole is capable of accommodating around 900 dwellings (with the consultation proforma stating that the site could accommodate 791 dwellings). This does not take into account any potential design constraints, open space requirements, or buffer areas, etc. Final numbers would be discussed in greater detail with the Council during the

North Comments

Name: S. W. Fraser Trustees C/o Smiths Gore

Representor No: PRS06077 Representation ID: REP06931

preparation of any future masterplan for the area.

The site undulates slightly in topography, however, is considered wholly developable. The developable area is therefore considered to be approximately 30 hectares. We would be willing to discuss an exact site boundary in greater detail with the Council in due course. The site boundary is well defined and is predominantly surrounded by established residential development. There are also some trees / shrubs located within the site, mainly along the field boundaries. As there is limited tree coverage on the site, development of the land is considered to have limited adverse impacts on the local trees. Any proposed development, however, would include the necessary arboricultural surveys and aim to retain as many trees as possible. The site is not within a Conservation Area and the site is not known to be subject to any Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's). We consider it unlikely that there will be any restrictive ecology issues to stop the site being delivered for housing, but any future masterplan or planning application would be supported by the necessary ecology reports to enable the local planning authority to determine the outcome of an application with all detailed information to hand. It is noted that the West Yorkshire Ecology and Leeds City Council Ecology Officer support the site coming forward on biodiversity grounds, provided that the wooded areas (including Hunger Hills Wood / Local Nature Reserve) are retained and the scheme was to include buffers alongside the wooded areas and add to the woodland edge habitat.

Due to the site being immediately adjacent to the built up residential area of Horsforth, in close proximity to a wide range of local services and facilities (including shops, restaurants, churches, sports facilities, open space, and education (including Leeds Trinity University)), the land is considered to be wholly appropriate for new housing development based on a robust masterplan approach to retain and enhance those areas of ecological and nature conservation importance. The site is also in close proximity to bus stops with regular bus services and, Horsforth Train Station to the north east of the site. The site is therefore considered to have excellent access to the local highways network and a range of public transport provision.

Lee Lane Farmhouse (Grade II Listed) is located north of the site and Springfield Farmhouse (also Grade II Listed) is located to the west of the site. Both properties, however, fall outside the site boundary and any future development of Site 1015 would be designed so that future development would not have an adverse impact on these buildings. The site is not within an area of high flood risk (please see the attached Environment Agency plan for reference), it is not a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or national nature conservation designation and is not within a minerals safeguarded site or within the airport safety zone. It is therefore considered that the land is suitable to be delivered for residential development over the plan period.

Based on the above - and as the site falls within the settlement hierarchy of the Core Strategy - Leeds City Council should consider the site as a suitable, available, achievable and deliverable site to accommodate large scale future housing growth in the North Leeds Area. The future development of the site would create an attractive, vibrant and successful place, promoting a long term sustainable community and delivering quality housing in an area of high market demand. Additional housing choice in the area is considered to be a benefit to local communities and to the district as a whole; helping meet the local housing needs and demands during the plan period. The scale of development in the area is not considered to be detrimental to the existing infrastructure and landscape and relevant supporting document would be used to support a future planning application, in due course, if deemed necessary by the local planning authority.

The only limitation to bringing the site forward for development in the short term is its location within the Green Belt. However, it is considered that this site does not add to the Green Belt or comply with the 5 purposes identified in the NPPF for identifying land to be designated as Green Belt. Development of the site would not lead to the unrestricted sprawl of large built up area as the site is confined by existing development (please see above for further detail). The development of the site would not lead to neighboring towns merging together as Hunger Hills Wood would continue to form a distinctive barrier between development and the site is located in the centre of Horsforth. If anything, development of the site would make Horsforth a more accessible settlement in Leeds, linking Leeds Trinity University and other local services and facilities with existing residents in a more suitable manner. The site is not valuable countryside and the majority of the land is only Grade 4 (poor quality - land with severe limitations which significantly restrict the range of crops and/or level of yields) agricultural land. The site does not preserve the setting and special character of a historic town and, finally, the development of the site would help address the housing need and demand in the area without having an adverse impact on urban regeneration as the site is not located in close proximity to a major regeneration area.

Although the site was identified as creating pressures on Greenfield sites in the Sustainability Appraisal, this affects the majority of sites put forward for development during this plan period and should not be a reason for refusing the identification of Site 1015 as an acceptable site for residential development. The site is considered in the Sustainability Appraisal to have an adverse impact on landscape quality (Objective 19). We would strongly refute this assertion. The site will be well contained in an appropriate location and will help address the housing need and demand in the area without having an adverse impact on the countryside. A scheme of this size would also include well designed public open space and significant landscaped areas. It is therefore considered the future development of the site could enhance the existing landscaping features in the area and enhance Hunger Hills Wood. Our clients would be willing to undertake a robust landscape assessment to help address any concerns raised in respect of landscape quality, if deemed necessary by the Council.

We do not consider that the site meets the 5 purposes of being within the Green Belt. The land is well connected to the urban area and contained by existing defined boundaries and is a sustainable, deliverable site for future residential development and its delivery would not have a significant detrimental impact on the local environment. Our client wishes to bring the site forward for development. It is considered available for development throughout the whole plan period and would generate significant market interest. We therefore urge the Council to reassess the land and identify the site to be a 'green', suitable site to accommodate future residential development.

Site Ref: 1016 – Land at Broadway and Calverley Lane, Horsforth

The site is currently identified as 'amber' in the consultation document. It is situated within a sustainable location, located within the built up area of Horsforth which forms part of the main urban area of Leeds. The site in question is approximately 0.5 hectares and is currently vacant. Please see the attached plan for further detail. Access is available directly from Calverley Lane and the site is supported for development by the Council's Highways Offices for approximately 13 dwellings. We note that 'Site Allocations Plan Volume 2: 5 North' set out on page 11 that Highways have concerns regarding local traffic congestion if Site 1016 was developed, however, the site proforma states that that this would only be a concern to the Highways Officers if development was to exceed 13 units. Based on the size of the site and on an average density of 30 dwellings per hectare, our client would not be looking to bring the site forward for more than 13 dwellings. This concern should therefore be removed from the assessment and on this basis that site should be reassessed as 'green'.

The site is flat in topography and is considered wholly developable. The developable area is therefore considered to be approximately 0.5 hectares. It is therefore considered that this site, in its sustainable location, should be released for housing development. The site boundary is well defined and is surrounded by predominantly established residential development. The site's development for up to 13 dwellings would serve to round off the settlement and establish a firm boundary.

There are a few trees / shrubs located along the boundary of the site, however, not significant enough to have an adverse impact on the future development of the site. Any proposed development, however, would include the necessary arboricultural surveys and aim to retain as many trees as possible. The site is within a Conservation Area and this would be taken into consideration with regard to any future development to ensure that what is delivered would reflect the urban grain and enhance the overall design quality of the surrounding area. Although the site is within the Conservation Area, this should not be a reason to preclude development and any future planning application would serve to appropriately control the quality of design.

We consider there to be limited ecology restrictions to prevent the delivery of the site for housing. In addition, the West Yorkshire Ecology and Leeds City Council Ecology Officer support the site coming forward for development and consider the site of low ecological value. Again, however, any planning application would be supported by the necessary ecology reports to enable the local planning authority to determine the outcome of

North Comments

Name: S. W. Fraser Trustees C/o Smiths Gore

Representor No: PRS06077 Representation ID: REP06931

an application in a detailed manner.

Due to the site being within the built up environment of Horsforth, the site is in close proximity to a wide range of local services and facilities. These include shops, restaurants, churches, sports facilities, school and open space. The site is also in close proximity to bus stops and regular bus services and Horsforth Train Station. The site is therefore considered to not only have good access to the local highways, but also to public transport. It is therefore considered that the site is a robust site to come forward for residential development during the plan period. Furthermore, our clients land is not within an area of high flood risk (please see the attached Environment Agency plan for reference); the site is not within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or national nature conservation designation and, is not within a minerals safeguarded site or within the airport safety zone.

Based on the above - and as the site falls within the settlement hierarchy of the Core Strategy - Leeds City Council should consider the site as a suitable, available, achievable and deliverable site to accommodate future housing growth in the North Leeds Area. The future development of the site would create an attractive, vibrant and successful place, promoting a long term sustainable community and delivering quality housing in an area of high market demand. Additional housing choice in the area is considered to be a benefit to local communities and to the district as a whole; helping meet the local housing needs and demands during the plan period. The scale of development in the area is not considered to be detrimental to the existing infrastructure and landscape and relevant supporting document would be used to support a future planning application in due course to back this up, if deemed necessary by the planning authority.

The only limitation to bringing the site forward for development in the short term is its location within the Green Belt. The land is Green Belt but has strong links to the urban area and is well contained eliminating potential for future urban sprawl. It is considered that this site does not add to the Green Belt or comply with the 5 purposes identified in the NPPF for identifying land to be designated as Green Belt. Development of the site would not lead to the unrestricted sprawl of large built up area based on the natural boundaries of the site (please see above for further detail). The development of the site would not lead to neighboring towns merging together. The site is not valuable countryside or utilised agricultural land. The site does not preserve the setting and special character of a historic town and, finally, the development of the site would help address the housing need and demand in the area without having an adverse impact on urban regeneration as the site is not located in close proximity to a major regeneration area.

Although the site was identified in the Sustainability Assessment as having an adverse impact on greenfield land and is considered to add to pollution in the area (Objectives 11 and 18) these objectives affect the majority of sites put forward for development during this plan period. This should not be a reason for refusing the identification of Site 1016 as an acceptable site for residential development.

Notwithstanding the site's Green Belt allocation, the site is well connected to the urban area and contained by existing defined boundaries and the land is a sustainable, deliverable site for future residential development and its delivery would not have a significant detrimental impact on the local environment. Our client wishes to bring the site forward for development. We therefore urge the Council to reassess the land and identify the site to be a 'green', suitable site to accommodate future residential development.

Phasing

We acknowledge that phasing of sites will take place at a later stage of the plan; however, it is considered that Sites 1014 and 1016 are available for short to medium term development, with Site 1015 being phased throughout the plan period.

Safeguarding Land

There is also the need to safeguard land for future development. It is vital that the council provides sufficient land for long term development to ensure long term endurance of the Green Belt boundaries and provide a reserve of potential sites for longer term development needs beyond the plan period. This is in line with Policy SP10 of the Core Strategy. If the Council can not support the future development of all our clients land for development during this plan period, we would urge that all of the relevant sites above be removed from the Green Belt for short – medium term development or, safeguarded for future development post plan period.

Conclusion

All (or part of) our client's landholding is available, suitable and deliverable for residential development over the plan period and should be considered as part of a robust Green Belt Review. Our client's sites (please see attached plans for reference) would represent appropriate and well contained development sites in Horsforth. They are of no special character and can be developed in keeping with surrounding properties and will be a particular enhancement of the Conservation Area, where appropriate. The sites are all ideally placed to provide the flexible and continuous supply of housing land that national and local guidance requires. Our clients, the S. W. Fraser Trustees, would like to work closely and in partnership with the Council to support and help deliver sustainable growth in North Leeds. It is considered that the land identified on the attached plans should be allocated for residential development or at least safeguarded for future development and therefore removed from the Green Belt designation.

North Comments

Name: S. W. Fraser Trustees C/o Smiths Gore

Representor No: PRS06077 **Representation ID:** REP06957

Question Ref: G1

See representation submitted for full details and housing rep 06931

Site Ref: 1014 – Land at Fraser Avenue, Horsforth

The existing land use of the site is for grazing, however, we note that it is identified as 'potential' open space in the UDP. Notwithstanding this, the 'Site Allocations Plan Volume 2: 5 North' document (page 30) acknowledges that the existing UDP Policy N5 (proposed Green Space) designation at Fraser Avenue was not identified as being in green space use in the Open Space Audit and has clearly not been delivered through Policy N5.

The Council should therefore delete the green space allocation and, given the site's sustainable location, release the land for housing development.

The site is generally flat in topography with a slight slope and is considered wholly suitable for high quality new housing development to reflect the existing urban grain and enhance the local area. The developable area is believed to be approximately 1.2 hectares. However, we would be willing to discuss an exact site boundary in greater detail with the council, in due course.

North Comments

Name: Jillian Sabourn

Representor No: PRS03222 Representation ID: REP02033

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Garden Grabbing is not the best way to increase housing in a quiet residential area. An unsympathetic infill development will substantially degrade the character of a well established residential area.

Question Ref: H2

The View , Alwoodley, LS17 7NBRef: 118ReasonsMultiple housing on a site which currently has two bungalows will; Negatively change the character of a very quiet residential street. Increase the traffic on this very quiet street where children play out safely at the moment. Increase drainage problems by increasing the amount of hard core/tarmac on the properties. We live opposite but also below the site and rainwater/drain problems will run directly into our property. Increase the noise due to significantly more traffic. There could be as many as 10-15 extra cars. Damage the mature and established trees which not only will change the green character of the area but could again increase draining problems as the root systems are damaged. Change the character of a 1930's street which would not be aesthetically pleasing and will also bring down the value of my property.Planning permission for this development has been refused twice in previous years, and all the objections that were the case for refusal last time will still apply.

Question Ref: H3

No

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

See previous question. ave answered this.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: General comment

Please consider comments relating to the View, Alwoodley.

North Comments

Name: Aras Saleh

Representor No: PRS04002 Representation ID: REP01675

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

I am opposed to development of greenbelt site and I am also opposed to greenfield development.

Question Ref: H2

I am opposed to development of greenbelt site and I am also opposed to greenfield development.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

Dunstarn lane- 62 homes, holt park -85 homes, Ralph Thorseby-15 homes, Church lane-186 homes

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: General comment

I am opposed to development of greenbelt sites

North Comments

Name: Kim Sanderson

Representor No: PRS02332 Representation ID: REP04584

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Michelle Sanderson

Representor No: PRS02334 **Representation ID:** REP04585

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Agree The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Agree

North Comments

Name: Daniel Sanderson

Representor No: PRS02461 **Representation ID:** REP04725

Question Ref: H1

1199 – Moseley Bottom, Green to Red. Agree Cookridge needs no more housing developments.

Strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this.

Agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

North Comments

Name: Santos

Representor No: PRS02163 Representation ID: REP04388

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree The road network is insufficient to deal with the extra traffic The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree The schools are already at capacity The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree The wildlife in this area is extremely diverse and there are lots of rare species Building on this land would be a travesty .

North Comments

Name: Ian Sapiro

Representor No: PRS05604 **Representation ID:** REP06262

Question Ref: H7

I am writing as a local resident (Brownberrie Avenue) to express my support for the planning officers' recommendation that the above sites are not suitable for the allocation of housing. I would also like to express my support for the restoration and small-scale development of the listed buildings at Ling Bob Farm (applications 13/01931/FU and 13/01932/LI), which will ensure the survival of these 17th-century buildings. Finally, I would like to commend the planning officers and Leeds City Council on the decision to find the Ling Bob and North Ives sites unsuitable for housing.

North Comments

Name: Fitton Sarah

Representor No: PRS01251 **Representation ID:** REP03355

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The infrustructure can't cope!! The road are already over congested/parked. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. As already stated the residential access roads around the propsed development are already over parked, congested. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The local servies surgeries are already over subscribed and waiting times for appointment at already an unacceptable level. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. The fields surrounding Moseley Beck have, over the years increasingly become like marsh level and more hard standing with increase water run off/flooding risk. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. The ecological impact of further development will be significant.

North Comments

Name: Celia Savage

Representor No: PRS00321 Representation ID: REP02267

Question Ref: H1

1199 - Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge —Taylor Wimpey

I attended the meeting at the Cookridge Village Hall yesterday and was quite distraught to find out more details of the above proposed housing planning site. I write as an observer who has lived in Cookridge for 45 years and in the above house for 35 years.

Cookridge has become totally over-populated over the years and Green Lane was never built for the volume and type of vehicle that we now experience. Parking can become hazardous in the locality. I understand that there will be two outlets onto Green Lane, one near the school (Moseley Wood Rise/Moseley Wood Drive?) and another at the end of Cookridge Drive. I would like to remind the Council that at the Horsforth end of Green Lane/Woodhill Road has a substantial rise and curve on to Tinsill Road which is now very busy and with much parking. Bear in mind the buses use this route as well. Many a time it takes a little while to exit on this hill — a backup of traffic would not be safe.

The Cookridge Lane end of Green Lane has its own problems. There is a curve round Green Lane where Cookridge Drive joins, leading to Cookridge Lane which is now a much busier road. There have been fatalities and accidents round this area, and with the buses turning into & out of Green Lane at Cookridge Lane junction, and the parking of cars where necessary and two bus-stops, makes it a busy corner especially in peak times. I would like to point out that there are three detached houses for sale at this end, two of which are vacant — when they are occupied the car situation will again become very busy — I imagine that in your Highway Survey of this area this would not have been taken into account. As the airport grows this also leads to more use of Cookridge Lane. Many people use Pinfold Lane for walking etc. and exiting to cross this road can be hazardous.

All this, of course, is where we are now. With the possibility of 200 extra houses, and the traffic that will feed into Green Lane and surrounding roads, will make the area a very dangerous one and I am extremely worried the effect this will have on us all, especially the vulnerable.

I would also mention, that the facilities have lagged behind as the population has grown (what is there for young people?), and I do wonder why on earth the green belt with limited access, is being used and not more suitable brown-fill sites.

As I mentioned, I am writing as a concerned observer who is deeply worried at the effect this badly thought-out project will bring and the dangers that lurk.

North Comments

Name: Celia Savage

Representor No: PRS00321 Representation ID: REP04402

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom - Green to Red.

I strongly agree that Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Cookridge is already over populated with roads never made for volume/type of traffic - lack of facilities - Highly dangerous.

I strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Green lane a big problem and will cause safety issues with school etc.

I strongly agree that Local schools such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand.

I strongly agree that the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. If there is flooding already it must be an issue. I strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat, once wildlife is gone it never comes back.

This follows on from my letter to you dated 28th June

North Comments

Name: Rita Savage

Representor No: PRS02460 Representation ID: REP04724

Question Ref: H1

1199 – Moseley Bottom, Green to Red. Strongly agree Cookridge needs no more housing developments.

Strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this.

Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

North Comments

Name: Claire Saville

Representor No: PRS05835 Representation ID: REP06545

Question Ref: H1

My concerns are as follows:-

Highways issues – the impact of all the proposed developments on surrounding roads. The adjacent roads are not designed as access roads but residential roads, there is a very good chance that many of these roads will become “rat runs” for the new development and cause increased traffic and a safety issue for existing residents. There is inadequate road infrastructure to cope with the additional housing. There will be significant peak hour traffic problems on surrounding roads especially at Horsforth Bridge which can't be widened.

Extra vehicles will create more roadside parking in an area which already has a problem which in turn causes concern for access to emergency vehicles.

This development will be cut off if we have heavy weather (like the last two years). How will the access to the site be made, which routes will the heavy plant use. Will this be restricted to “office hours” Access for sites traffic will be dangerous and problematic. All these issues will have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area over a long period as we are made to believe that the building will be spread over a six year period.

Has access to medical services been assessed– this is part of the infrastructure needs for the area. Recent changes to medical provision in the area has already left many people facing a car journey to visit a doctor, where will 200 more families be able to obtain these facilities?

Has the impact on access to both primary and secondary school places been assessed as the area is already suffering due to the changes to Horsforth High schools admissions policy. The local primary schools are already oversubscribed and it may force more people to take their children to school by car if they can't access local schools – surely this doesn't make environmental sense.

Population growth – the population of Leeds is not currently growing at the rate expected. There are already over 500 properties for sale in the LS16 post code area and other new local developments are not fully sold. – do we need more? Potential flooding/drainage issues are always a concern. Many gardens on Moseley Wood Gardens already flood as does the proposed development site.

This could cause a knock on effect to the area if this causes flood problems on the local railway line which does flood at the beck; more housing would surly cause extra problems.

The increase in local population, with 200 extra homes would have many issues associated with it, what will the parking at the one and only local shop (Tesco) be like? It's bad enough as it is. There are very few local amenities in cookridge these would be stretched to the limit.

Potential public transport issues are also cause for concern the bus route can't go any nearer to these homes as the roads are not suitable for busses which makes it a fare walk to the bus stops, a bus which could be lost if the new transport system proposed to run from Holt Park to Leeds goes ahead. The local station is already overcrowded with trains running dangerously full the knock on would be greater congestion Headingley and Burly Park and the parking around the station is spreading out causing more congestion, again extra housing and therefore people and cars would just exacerbate the problem.

Lack of appropriate infrastructure and the fact that no needs assessment have been carried out by Leeds City Council to date and that this is needed urgently.

The local wildlife, flora and fauna need to be protected and further development will not help this. The area is home to foxes and a wide array of birds including Red Kites, Herrons, Woodpeckers and migratory Wax wings to name a few. The beck is also a great habitat that would be lost to generation if the area was overdeveloped.

No sympathy has been given to the current residents who will loose their outlook by the fact that the development backs right onto their property but leaves space on the far side of the plot. Living on a building site for up to six years would be detrimental to both quality of life and health.

I hope these comments and those of other concerned residents are give due consideration and that this doesn't just become a financial decision.

North Comments

Name: Toby Savin

Representor No: PRS03792 **Representation ID:** REP01993

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Otley appears to be bearing the brunt of new housing development in the Outer North West area to a disproportionate extent. My main concern - other than losing a very nice walking area - is the lack of infrastructure. Otley has one nursery; it has one secondary school. Additionally, public transport links to the most likely areas of work (Leeds, Bradford and Harrogate) are limited at best. Traffic to/from these cities is already dreadful. Put simply, there is no way that the town's current infrastructure can support a development of the size proposed.

Question Ref: H2

Site 745 - East of Otley. The Local Development Framework schedule of sites does not include details of sites which are carried forward from the Urban District Plan. Also, there is no mention of the issues identified in the UDP hearing (eg: relief road) and there has been no progress in addressing these issues since the hearing.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H6

I believe that the following two sites currently classified as red should be re-classified as amber: Site 2051B (South West of Eccup Reservoir) This is a large site that runs into site 2051A; it is located much closer to Leeds and has a far better transport infrastructure to support housing development. It also has clearly defined boundaries. Site 2054 (South East of Eccup Reservoir) This is also a large site, adjacent to site 2053B, which is itself already classified amber. Again, this site has a far more appropriate transport infrastructure and more clearly defined boundaries.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

See Question 6.

Question Ref: H8

As per the answer to Question 6, two sites currently classified as red should be re-classified as amber (site 2051B and site 2054).

North Comments

Name: Hazel Saxton

Representor No: PRS06295 **Representation ID:** REP07221

Question Ref: H4

1)Environmental impact

I admire the way Leeds has kept a largely wooded green corridor into the heart of the city along the river Aire. And this in spite of the industrial development served by road, rail and canal. In this area, the woodland is represented by the precious scrap of Swaine Wood. This already has a degraded understorey because of overuse by bikers and walkers. Adding several hundred more people right next to the woodland will hasten the degradation, and over time may threaten its viability

There is also the framework of mature trees and some hedgerows in Newlaithes Fields themselves. These form a valuable resource for wildlife but would, of course, disappear on development. Existing trees never seem to be included in development plans.

2)Access

The planning department already recognizes there are problems with access. I am sure everyone who has responded will have detailed the severe impact of this on the wider area, so I will not tax you with reading it again.

3)Infrastructure

Do developers make a contribution towards any increased costs incurred by the host local authority as the result of the development? A pot-hole levy perhaps or a p-tax for new sewage works? Or do they plan in isolation and leave others to pay for any increased services?

A major problem in this part of Horsforth is provision of school places. The two nearest primary schools, Newlaithes and Featherbank, have already been enlarged to cater for the increase in birth-rate from families already living here. With development already agreed for the Sandoz site and land off Victoria Avenue the pressure on school places will increase. I'm sure I don't need to dot the i's and cross the t's.

4)Health issues.

You must be tired of hearing about traffic problems on the ring road, so may be pleased that I do not intend to detail them again. However, an air pollution study on the hill approaching the roundabout with the A65 might yield interesting results. Are there any plans to do this?

North Comments

Name: Linsey Sayner

Representor No: PRS05618 **Representation ID:** REP06274

Question Ref: H1

Re: Proposed development of Site No. 1199 (Moseley Wood Bottom)

I am writing to express my concern over the proposed development at Moseley Bottom. As a regular visitor with friends and family in the area, I share the concerns of many for the inevitable disruption that the heavy construction traffic would cause to the local community. It is causing considerable distress to the existing residents as we anticipate a huge strain on the local infrastructure, existing healthcare and educational facilities, and substantial environmental impact from increased littering and habitat destruction.

North Comments

Name: Janet Scaife

Representor No: PRS02438 **Representation ID:** REP04699

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree The current infrastructure cannot cope with proposed developments on this scale
The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Roads are becoming more congested and parked cars are causing
visibility problems Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree Already
problems with local schools oversubscribed and causing anxiety to local families. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More
building will affect this Strongly agree Housing will add to local flooding risks as there will be less open land to drain the rain. Moseley Bottom is
an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree Residents need a green space and green outlook to diffuse the stresses of every day life.

North Comments

Name: Arnd Dominik Schlosshan

Representor No: PRS04942 **Representation ID:** REP01620

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

I oppose the housing development on greenbelt sites. These sites in North Leeds are an integral part of North Leeds and the community that is not only values by the local resident but also by all Leeds residents. Leeds is know as one of the greenest cities in the UK. I receive many visitors who comment on this. Greenbelt sites should therefore be treasured and protected from development. Leeds should prioritise the numerous brownfield sites across the city before as well as bringing back into use empty properties. Also additional housing in this area would put additional pressure on already stretched local amenities.Greenbelt areas are the face of Leeds and are enjoyed by many. So lets not destroy them.

Question Ref: H2

All above reasons are valid for this.Areas: 1178A, 1299A, 1033

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

2130Same reasons as above

Question Ref: H5

as above

Question Ref: H6

as above

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H8

as above

Question Ref: H11

No

Question Ref: H12

No not suitable

North Comments

Name: Geoffrey Scott

Representor No: PRS02025 Representation ID: REP04226

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. No infrastructure to support more Houses. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. I cannot believe that lorries will try and get down some loval streets which are sometimes difficult by car. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Have seen the effects of floodings (2006). Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. There are gadgers, toads, newts, deer present.

North Comments

Name: Mandy Scott

Representor No: PRS02127 Representation ID: REP04350

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom - Green to Red.

Cookridge needs no more housing developments, Moseley Wood Gardens is a rat run as it is, we would struggle with an increase in traffic.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem.

Local schools such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand, there is a waiting list already at local schools, appointment times at doctors have a long wait for appointments.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this, it floods now. Hardstanding from more buildings will make matters worse.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat, lovely wildlife area, children can see wildlife, greenery, plants etc down there.

North Comments

Name: Peter Scott

Representor No: PRS02134 **Representation ID:** REP04359

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom - Green to Red.

Cookridge needs no more housing developments.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem

Local schools such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat

North Comments

Name: Paul Scott

Representor No: PRS03738 Representation ID: REP00110

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

I do not agree with the proposed building of houses on Moseley wood bottom because I strongly believe that the area should be preserved for the local wildlife. We have so many different species insects,birds,mammals and also newts, which I believe are a protected species. There is an established fox den that has been there years, it is a joy to see the foxes out and about in the evening time. Another major issue is the local schools, they are already at full capacity and can not cope with potentially another 150 kids that could move to the new housing estate. As a builder myself I also have concerns with the drainage. The field floods quite often and the stream burst its banks in heavy rain, the majority of the field is marshland, there are at least 4 natural springs running through the field and there are pockets of water scattered all over. I have worked on sites in the past where building company have tried to solve these problems and they had a lot of problems. Subsidence was one of them, the divert system they put in did not work. Natural springs are there for a purpose and will always find a way of getting where they want to go. If you build over all the fields in question you are taking away a huge part of the natural surface water drainage for the whole Moseley wood area. By putting in houses,roads etc the surface water will run into the beck a lot faster having no fields to filter the flow and burst its banks and potentially flooding the train tracks, which has flooded before without any houses been built on the land. I strongly recommend you take these points into account and focus your attention on brown field sites around bigger towns that can sustain the growth of the population.

Question Ref: H2

1199 land of Moseley wood gardens, Cookridge Reasons as above and also:Access to medical services Highway issuesInadequate road infrastructure to cope with additional housingEcology, wildlife etcPublic transport issuesPotential visual impact

Question Ref: H3

No

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

1151 Cookridge lane. It is green field land and should stay green field.3044 Cookridge hall golf club. Self explanatory. Should remain a golf club3360 Cookridge hall. As above a very nice country club and I'm sure it must be a listed building

Question Ref: H9

1199 Moseley wood gardens. This should remain green belt land for the sake of the local wildlife. Making this a nature reserve would be an ideal option for the council.

Question Ref: H12

No,defiantly not.

Question Ref: H13

No

Question Ref: General comment

I would like to add that we should be looking to build on brown belt land only and leave the country side alone. It is what makes Yorkshire a great place to live in. I would expect our local councils to support preservation of our green fields. I understand we need to have growth but it should be thought out and identify specific sites that can sustain the influx of new housing estates.

North Comments

Name: Lee Scott

Representor No: PRS03759 Representation ID: REP00219

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Green belt is there for a reason, why would anyone in the right mind want to destroy it when there is other more suitable options.

Question Ref: H2

Site reference 1199 in Cookridge Leeds. The traffic through Horsforth and Cookridge is already very extreme, isn't it enough that Sandoz in Horsforth is been turned into housing which is going to cause absolute carnage for all people who live or pass through these areas without adding to it by building these homes in Cookridge just to make matters even worse? On top of the obvious traffic issues and stress you are going to cause locals I also think you need to consider the beautiful areas around Cookridge which you are now planning to destroy along with all the animals that you are going to disturb and in some cases kill. Green belt should be preserved so people can actually enjoy it.

Horsforth and Cookridge are both already over crowded and they simply cannot handle more housing.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

NA

Question Ref: H5

1199 already gave you my reasons in previous comments.

Question Ref: H6

NA

Question Ref: H7

y

North Comments

Name: Jo Scott

Representor No: PRS04543 Representation ID: REP00070

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Site reference: 1199 - The site 'Moseley Wood Bottom' is not suitable for development due to three main concerns, which are: 1. Drainage 2. Infrastructure to include: a) Transportation concerns, b) Education, c) employment, d) local amenities, e) Health support 3. Ecology 1. Drainage: The site is water logged in the area where site access will be; considering the railway line is at the bottom of this land and there is a stream that already floods in bad weather, should drainage be directed into this stream there is potential to flood the railway line. In bad weather rain runs down Moseley Wood Rise into the field, this will not change and housing if built will become flooded. Has consideration also been taken into how, in winter, residents will be able to get out of the estate?? Walking through this site there are many undulations, my husband who is a builder, who will be putting his concerns forward, believes the land is unstable. My husband built and extension onto our house and the groundwork was troublesome, the footings had to be extended in order to find 'hard' ground. During the dig many extremely large rocks (quarry like) were also unearthed. 2. Infrastructure: a) Transportation: Moseley Wood Gardens already supports over 200 houses, of which most households would be considered to be a two car family; therefore over 400 vehicles are coming and going on this road, to add to this a potential of another 400 vehicles would be detrimental to the residents in this area and to the environment. One entrance and exit site will place an extreme amount of pressure onto such small roads and increase the potential for road traffic incidents. Presumably most residents would have employment within the city and access into Leeds is already congested whichever route is taken. The vital railway link is already under strain with most people only having standing room on the peak periods of travel, not to mention the distinct lack of parking at the station. At peak times the roads are congested with people coming to and from the station which is a bottle neck due to poor road planning, more people needing to use the station will add to this existing problem. b) Education: There are only two primary schools in Cookridge, both of which take a double intake of 60 children per cohort and both these schools were full when I was trying to secure a place for my daughter in 2010; how can these 2 schools support further increase in housing? I would presume that the type of housing that will be built would be family type units, therefore again taking an average of at least 2 children per household there could be a potential of 400 children trying to secure places at their most local schools and it is clear that the existing schools cannot accommodate this increase. I have attended recent meetings to hear how the concern of available places in schools has been considered and have been disappointed to hear that Ireland Wood Primary could take further pupils; but as a working mother of small children it is vital to be able to take your children to your most local school. It is important for community spirit to be able to walk your children to school whereby friendships and support networks can be formed and it also encourages the children to remain fit and healthy, to take this opportunity away from residents would be detrimental. c) Employment, d) Local amenities: Cookridge does not have the amenities that the neighbouring town of Horsforth has, with respect to shops, hair dressers, library, banks etc. It is clear that should this development proceed then there will be a further increase of traffic into Horsforth which is already congested. As discussed above residents will need to travel to their place of employment, will this be by car, train or bus? The nearest bus stop is Green lane, will they have to walk quite a long distance to catch a bus? Moseley Wood Gardens could not and I would strongly petition against becoming a bus route, this is a quiet rural, residential area where many families with children and retired people live and again to increase the amount of traffic with potential for future transport links would be a disaster for residents. e) Has consideration been taken into whether there would be enough support with regards to the health of the community? When booking an appointment with the doctor the waiting list is generally a week at least. Will doctors' surgeries be able to cope with an increase in the community? 3. Ecology: This is an aspect that concerns me greatly; the land already supports a huge variety of wildlife not to mention an established foxes den. How, if this development goes ahead will the foxes be dealt with? Will they just be dug up and killed? This land is a natural reserve for wildlife, with many birds (house martins, kestrels, red kites, sparrow hawks, blue tits, great tits, great spotted wood peckers, tawny owls, black birds, starlings, magpies, jackdaws, crows, jays, sparrows to mention but a few of the species I have spotted. Not only are there a wide range of birds, but there are also many amphibians, with frogs, toads and newts being spotted; along with a huge variety of small mammals such as: mice, shrews, etc. This land should be left for nature, there are many brown field sites that should be developed. There are existing areas within or near to Cookridge that could be developed, such as the land where The Eyrie Public House is sited or the land off West Park where the derelict education centre is; these sites are already on major routes and would not cause harm to the ecology of the area other than the build itself.

Question Ref: H2

1151 agree with colour code 3044 agree with colour code 3360 agree with colour code

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

1151 I agree with colour code, this should remain as fields to support ecology 3044 I agree with the colour code, golf courses provide recreational opportunities for residents and encourages health, fitness and sportsmanship; but they also offer refuge to local wildlife such as rabbits & bats that are established on this site. 3360 I agree with this colour code with reference to the detail provided above. Cookridge Hall provides residents with the opportunity to join a health club, again promoting health and fitness within the community and providing the already established community with job opportunities. The site is set in lovely countryside with the golf course adjoining which provides a stress free environment and a refuge for wildlife.

Question Ref: H8

As above

Question Ref: H9

1199 - For reasons already provided

North Comments

Name: Elizabeth Scott

Representor No: PRS05083 Representation ID: REP05651

Question Ref: H7

It would spoil the peacefulness of Adel, and will cause too much traffic on small roads. Drainage has to be thought of and schools would need to be provided. Could cause flooding, too much green belt used. If any are built, they should be affordable housing and only a few

Question Ref: H7

As the government want affordable housing, these should be 3 bedroomed and no bigger

Question Ref: H7

I do not think any of the area in Adel should be considered for Gypsies

Question Ref: General comment

I found the plans difficult to work out hence I have commented on what pertains to me

North Comments

Name: J Scrace

Representor No: PRS02011 Representation ID: REP04210

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly Agree not enough facilities etc i.e schools. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly Agree Will effect people getting to work. Nightmare in bad weather conditions. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly Records show that schools are at maximum level already. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Strongly AgreeNet Work Rail concerned of the effects. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly AgreeOur wildlife need their homes too.

North Comments

Name: Neeta Seager

Representor No: PRS04215 Representation ID: REP01644

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

We have concerns over to development proposals of Leeds City Council 1. the allocation process for future development being a government proposal imposed on the council. 2. suitable sites should commence with available brown field sites before green field. 3. has the council surveyed all suitable sites in this area including brown field sites? 4. discussions with the local communities not just on line form.

Question Ref: H2

We strongly disagree with the sites 3331 & 4095 in Knott Lane, Rawdon. Site 3331 is green field site and in a conservation area with thriving fauna/flora appreciated by the local residents/community of Rawdon and others. Wildlife such as fox, badgers, deer, bats, red kite, kestrel, sparrow hawk, woodpecker, goldcrest, nuthatch, siskin, black caps, wrens and common garden birds will be affected by these developments. Also a major gas service running through site 3331 would require diversion causing major concern to residents. Local schools would be effected eg St Peters by 120+ new intake also effecting existing catchment area with local families kids having to seek alternatives. Also Doctors & Dentist already overloaded would significantly affect, meaning obtaining appointments further complicated. Another concern is the effect on the local transport links. Knott Lane is well used and very busy at rush hour but also is the designated exit route from Rawdon Crematorium which causes major congestion throughout the day and can block the Lane by people exiting the Crematorium meaning access is not possible to local residents which would be worse by the proposed developments. The other major issue, A65 Leeds/Rawdon Road is regularly gridlocked during morning rush hour times with queues from A6120 Ring Road all the way back to Guiseley. Existing housing developments in Guiseley at High Royds and Netherfield Road have greatly increased the traffic volumes on the A65 with no corresponding improvements for the rail parking at both Guiseley and Horsforth stations, means congestion on A65 can only increase. These rail stations are unlikely to be used by new development residences, hence minor use of buses services, but mainly an increase in car commuter traffic would seriously affect the community. If these two developments were granted planning, it would mean Rawdon housing would be taken right up to the Horsforth/Rawdon border meaning any future developments in Horsforth (e.g. current development on the former Clariant site) could effectively treat the village status of Rawdon, losing the history for ever. The sprawl of development of Leeds has continued over the years with other villages becoming part of Leeds overall such as Horsforth. We know future housing developments are required and sensible sites need consideration before green field/conservation areas are spoilt/destroyed. The area of land at the bottom of Knott Lane/Low Hall Rd next to Clariant development should be considered together with the former Irwin site on the north side of Low Hall Rd.

Question Ref: H3

1104 - this site backs onto industrial area but very little other housing. Would not effect other residents. 2162 - neighbouring above, but with more effect on existing housing. Both sites are in a "dip" and hence not overlooked by significant other areas of housing.

Question Ref: H4

y

Question Ref: H4

No sites allocated in the Aireborough area.

Question Ref: H5

N/A for Aireborough area

Question Ref: H6

Site 1180B - coloured red due to highways issues and urban sprawl. Sites in Rawdon (3331 & 4095) coloured green but also have major highways concerns / urban sprawl - what is the difference ?

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

N/A

Question Ref: H8

N/A

Question Ref: H9

Sites 3331 & 4095. Reasons, refer to answers in question H2

Question Ref: H10

None that I can think of at present for the Aireborough area.

Question Ref: H11

The old Clariant site, Riverside Mills and the Old Irwin site, Low Hall Road, Horsforth - 0 - 5 years.

North Comments

Name: Neeta Seager

Representor No: PRS04215 Representation ID: REP01644

Question Ref: H12

No, none in the Aireborough area, due to existing overloaded facilities such as Schools, Dentist, Doctors.

Question Ref: H13

No.

Question Ref: H14

No.

Question Ref: H15

No

Question Ref: General comment

As stated in our response to H2, we do not understand the process the Council have used to categorise the potential development sites in the Aireborough area as certain sites that have been categorised as green e.g. site 3331 & 4095 which have issues regarding green belt / conservation areas, issues with local facilities, major issues with existing transportation infrastructure, yet they have still been categorised as "green" site for housing. If the Council had engaged with the local communities before drawing up their SAP to understand issues and concerns, they would have a better understanding and be able to take into consideration all issues and categorise sites more appropriately. Some sites which have been categorised as red due to "highways and urban sprawl" issues also apply to the above sites 3331 & 4095, but these are "green" sites. We believed that areas in green belt and in a conservation area as site 3331 would be protected from development and urban sprawl because of their importance to the local community, local environment, keeping villages separate from urban sprawl which has engulfed other villages like Horsforth. We strongly believe that brown field sites across Leeds should be first allocated for housing (assuming they are suitable), e.g. the Clariant site off Low Hall Road and the adjacent site further along Low Hall Road. We hope and wish that you take into consideration concerns of all local residents within Rawdon village / Rawdon Carrs when reviewing the feedback and ultimately allocating the correct and fair category and not allow future development on sites 3331 and 4095 which have always been green belt sites.

North Comments

Name: Nigel Seal

Representor No: PRS01563 Representation ID: REP03711

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Agree. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Agree There are not enough school places now without adding to the problem.

Agree - There are not enough school places now without adding to the problem.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Agree

Wildlife is very important to all those interested and should not be destroyed.

North Comments

Name: Jen Sebright-pickard

Representor No: PRS03390 **Representation ID:** REP01536

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I can understand most of the reasons put forward for the use of the green sites. These involve quite a lot of green belt, but in my opinion they are closer to Leeds and as such would not add to the traffic congestion until we get further down the A65

Question Ref: H3

2038 is coded amber, but is Brownfield. The fact that it would require remedial works before a residential use could be considered should not make so much difference. Surely the profit margins of the builders aren't the issue here. Brownfield should be considered before any scrap of greenbelt is used. After all Brownfield has already been developed, but once built on you will never get green belt back.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: H6

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H8

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H9

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

North Comments

Name: Jen Sebright-pickard

Representor No: PRS03390 **Representation ID:** REP01536

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area. I have submitted them as my own, as I agree with them entirely. [x]

North Comments

Name: Emma Sebright-pickard

Representor No: PRS04548 **Representation ID:** REP01539

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I can understand most of the reasons put forward for the use of the green sites. These involve quite a lot of green belt, but in my opinion they are closer to Leeds and as such would not add to the traffic congestion until we get further down the A65

Question Ref: H3

2038 is coded amber, but is Brownfield. The fact that it would require remedial works before a residential use could be considered should not make so much difference. Surely the profit margins of the builders aren't the issue here. Brownfield should be considered before any scrap of greenbelt is used. After all Brownfield has already been developed, but once built on you will never get green belt back.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: H6

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H9

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H10

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

North Comments

Name: Emma Sebright-pickard

Representor No: PRS04548 **Representation ID:** REP01539

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area. I have submitted them as my own, as I agree with them entirely. [x]

North Comments

Name: Patrick Seddon

Representor No: PRS00593 **Representation ID:** REP02576

Question Ref: G17

2055 Over the past fifty years or so., thousands of homes and a number of schools have been built in this area. There is no need for any further housing around here and it would be a for such a travesty distinguished property and its immediate vicinity to be used for unwanted development

North Comments

Name: Catharine M Seddon

Representor No: PRS00605 **Representation ID:** REP02574

Question Ref: G17

2055 I think the land in question should be retained as green space and do not understand the need for more housing in this particular area. The Judges Residence is of historical interest and the allotments provide an important recreation for local residents

North Comments

Name: Jane Sefton

Representor No: PRS01499 **Representation ID:** REP03638

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments- Strongly agree. The effect on increased traffic, noise, pollution and loss of amenity far outweigh the benefits of a development in this location.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem- Strongly agree. We struggle to get out of the street in winter due to its low location so increased traffic will only compound this problem.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly Agree. We have 3 school age children and it is a battle now to get a high school place. Extra families will only serve to make this problem worse

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this- Strongly agree. Our rear garden has serious flooding problems in heavy rain now and building work near our rear boundary will not improve drainage.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree. We moved here 5 years ago for the location, rear outlook and peaceful neighbourhood. This development would affect the birds, foxes, squirrels and other animals that live close by

North Comments

Name: Jane Sefton

Representor No: PRS01499 Representation ID: REP04049

Question Ref: H1

H1. See H2 for main reasons.

H2. Our main concern is the increased traffic generated in our local streets. We have 3 children under 12 so safety is our priority.

Our rear garden backs onto the field earmarked for development so we will be subjected to 6 years of increased traffic, noise, pollution and disruption throughout the development.

The local infrastructure ie. Schools, transport links, roads etc., cannot cope with the increase in vehicles and people.

Due to its low level, winter can be a problem in actually getting off the street as local roads are not gritted.

H3. Without reviewing each individual sit, we cannot comment on other potential development areas. However we strongly feel that the council should be making more use of the houses we have already got. Pressure should be out on landlords to offer affordable rents as too many properties are sitting empty. There are also many empty council properties that could be utilised to deal with the increasing demand without disturbing brown/greenbelt land.

North Comments

Name: L Sellers

Representor No: PRS01844 Representation ID: REP04015

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: L Sellers

Representor No: PRS01844 Representation ID: REP04015

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: L Sellers

Representor No: PRS01844 Representation ID: REP04015

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided..., then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: L Sellers

Representor No: PRS01844 **Representation ID:** REP04015

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: L Sellers

Representor No: PRS01844 Representation ID: REP04015

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: L Sellers

Representor No: PRS01844 Representation ID: REP04015

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in not way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: L Sellers

Representor No: PRS01844 **Representation ID:** REP04015

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Sylvia Sellers

Representor No: PRS05879 **Representation ID:** REP06624

Question Ref: H7

I agree with you that the site listed above is NOT SUITABLE FOR THE ALLOCATION OF HOUSING. Horsforth is a small village and could not cope with additional housing/population ie, infrastructure, traffic, roads, schools, Doctors, Dentists, The fields/woods are also habitat to a number of wild life and preservation. The above area and surrounding areas are a feature of natural beauty

North Comments

Name: Maurice Sellers

Representor No: PRS05883 Representation ID: REP06628

Question Ref: H7

I WOULD AGREE WITH YOU THAT SITE REF 1015 HUNGER HILLS AND LAND SOUTH OF LEE LANE WEST IS NOT SUITABLE FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT. DUE TO THE PROBLEMS OF HIGHWAYS ACCESS ALSO THIS SITE IS AN AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY. MY SONS DURING THEIR CHILDHOOD SPENT MANY HAPPY HOURS PLAYING IN HUNGER HILLS WOODS AND NOW THEIR CHILDREN MY GRANDCHILDREN ARE ENJOYING THESE OPEN SPACES AND MAYBE MY GRAND CHILDREN'S CHILDREN WILL ONE DAY ENJOY THESE SAME OPEN SPACES. THIS AREA IS ALSO AN OASIS TO COUNTLESS WILDLIFE

North Comments

Name: Phil Sercombe

Representor No: PRS01521 **Representation ID:** REP03662

Question Ref: H7

3327, 3328, 3330 [assumed 3330], 3034 - I am writing to strongly agree with the classification that these sites are NOT suitable for housing. Being a resident of the area I am only too aware of these narrow country lanes been overloaded with existing local traffic compounded by excessive use by people using the routes as "rat runs". To build a further 300 houses in an area that I understand to be classified as green belt would be unacceptable for that reason alone. Also, schools in the area are oversubscribed - where would the new demand be schooled?

There are significant brown field sites located close by at the former Kirkstall Forge and Sandoz works that are more suitable and I believe earmarked for development that would more than absorb any reasonable addition to housing in the area. The Kirkstall Forge site has the advantage of having a rail station included on the Bradford to Leeds line which will ease some of the extra congestion that the A65 will undoubtedly suffer wherever houses in the locale are build. For a small cost could something similar could be erected at Calverley for the Sandoz site. I remember the basic one at Burley Park being erected and the costs were relatively low, for the traffic benefits returned.

The Kirkstall Forge site has recently been down sized regarding house numbers based on costs. Surely any decision on moving any house building to these areas above rather than Kirkstall Forge would be based on developers profits rather than good planning. I am aware that all areas have to take extra capacity but let's keep Horsforth and surrounding allocations to existing brown field sites - there are others besides the ones I have noted.

As an additional observation - what about the eye sore car dealerships on Low Lane? An ideal opportunity to replace with housing in easy access of Horsforth station. We do not need car dealerships in residential areas anymore, +99% of car sales are to existing owners with access to out of town sites.

North Comments

Name: James Severn

Representor No: PRS02628 **Representation ID:** REP04932

Question Ref: H1

- 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: James Severn

Representor No: PRS02628 Representation ID: REP04932

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: James Severn

Representor No: PRS02628 Representation ID: REP04932

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: James Severn

Representor No: PRS02628 Representation ID: REP04932

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: James Severn

Representor No: PRS02628 Representation ID: REP04932

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: James Severn

Representor No: PRS02628 Representation ID: REP04932

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: James Severn

Representor No: PRS02628 **Representation ID:** REP04932

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Keith Seymour

Representor No: PRS03340 Representation ID: REP01987

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

The proposed allocation of "green" development sites would impose a completely disproportionate and unsupportable pressure on Otley in order to restrict green belt development across the rest of the Outer North West area. These proposals, if carried forward, would completely destroy the unique character of the town, place a completely unsupportable burden on local infrastructure and transport links, and totally unbalance the pattern of development around the north of Leeds.

Question Ref: H2

Site 744 (Rumplecroft) and Site 745 (East of Otley) These appear to have been included within "existing permissions" without any reference to outstanding and unresolved issues identified during the UDP process. Site 744 represents significant green belt encroachment to the north of the town, exacerbating already unsupported development on this side of the river in terms of retail and related services and the enormous and unsustainable terrible pressure historic bridge into the town. Site 745 Development of this area would represent significant urban sprawl along the A659, threatening clear boundaries between Otley and Poole in Wharfedale. Site 753 (Mill Lane Otley) appears to be alternatively identified in Plan 7.3 as Site 1122. This needs to be confirmed (or not) and clarified.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H6

Yes Site 2051B (South West of Eccup Reservoir- NOT King Lane, Alwoodley as described on Schedule) Site 2054 (South East of Eccup Reservoir - NOT Harrogate Road, Moortown as described on Schedule) See H7

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Site 2051B (King Lane, Alwoodley) Site 2054 (Harrogate road, Moortown) Both these sites should be identified as "Amber"

Question Ref: H8

Site 2051B- close to City centre with very good public transport and other access.- natural (reservoir and woodland) constraints to further development and offering excellent amenity opportunity. Site 2054- contiguous with Site 2053B (Amber) access- close to City centre, good public transport access.- existing link on to A61

North Comments

Name: John Shackleton

Representor No: PRS00271 Representation ID: REP02211

Question Ref: H7

1015 - Hunger Hills and
land south of Lee Lane West

Dear Sir

With reference to the above, in the recent Core Strategy planning proposal produced by Leeds city council, I understand that the area around Hunger Hills and land south of Lee Lane West is not considered suitable for allocation of housing.

I would like to say that I strongly agree with the council's decision to list this area as unsuitable for housing or any other form of development for the following reasons:

- The area provides habitat for a large range of wild animals and birds;
- The area is used by bats for foraging insects and access along hedgerows to other green spaces and roosting habitat;
- The footpaths and ancient bridleways which crisscross the area provide a valuable amenity to local people and the horse riding community;
- Access to the area would use existing roads which are already overcrowded and would represent further danger to local residents;
- Insufficient schools provision, local area schools are already oversubscribed;
- It provides a local green space in an area that is already heavily built up and is likely to become more so.
- The area has interesting local historical significance, with evidence of early industrial use along with mineral and coal extraction.

Many thanks.

North Comments

Name: E Shackleton

Representor No: PRS01463 **Representation ID:** REP03592

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. The current infrastructure cannot cope with a development of this size or even bigger. Years of construction traffic and noise will be intolerable and dangerous to children, the old and the infirm especially near the school/post office. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Moseley wood gardens is too narrow to cope with existing traffic. Never mind construction vehicles, local trains and station parking is inadequate now. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. Schools are oversubscribed now and very little in the way of local services available. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. If this is a flood plain, will home owners be able to get out of Cookridge. In the winter could be out off for days and the buses don't run either. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Once destroyed, gone forever - Green fields become a "concrete jungle" not what I want to see from my window.

P.S Network rail no doubt have concerns about the track getting flooded and possible concerns about tresspass. From the new development there could also be security issues with the proposed "Beckside Walk" during hours of darkness.

North Comments

Name: Jude Shackman

Representor No: PRS03646 Representation ID: REP00881

Question Ref: G1

Please note that Greenspace is also a vital part of human wellbeing and needs to be considered as such.

Question Ref: G2

n

Question Ref: G3

n

Question Ref: G4

n

Question Ref: G5

n

Question Ref: G6

y

Question Ref: CCG1

n

Question Ref: CCG2

n

Question Ref: G9

0

Question Ref: G10

0

Question Ref: G8

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G9

Retained for greenspace

North Comments

Name: Paul Shagouri

Representor No: PRS05567 **Representation ID:** REP06218

Question Ref: H7

On behalf of the Friends Hunger Hills Woods Horsforth I wish to comment on the above proposal & the subsequent decision by the Council to remove it from the list, as being unsuitable for development.

We are naturally pleased at this decision which mirrors the views of the vast majority of the residents of Horsforth as shown in the results of the Town Councils Community Consultation Summary of Responses May 2013. This showed that twice as many people thought the Woods & surrounding fields should be protected from development compared with any other sites in Horsforth.

The ambience of the woods with its long distance views would be ruined if development was allowed on the surrounding fields. This green space is very precious to local residents being easy to access from 4 different routes. The perimeter paths have recently been upgraded with funds from both the City & Town Council & as a result there has been a marked increase in the number of people using the wood for recreation & exercise.

Historically the woods were donated to the people of Horsforth by the Stanhope family in 1947 & ownership passed to LCC in 1974. A number of PROW footpaths criss cross the surrounding fields including part of the Leeds Country Way. All of which makes local people feel they have 'ownership' of this area.

North Comments

Name: S Sharma

Representor No: PRS01898 **Representation ID:** REP04071

Question Ref: H1

- 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: S Sharma

Representor No: PRS01898 Representation ID: REP04071

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: S Sharma

Representor No: PRS01898 Representation ID: REP04071

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: S Sharma

Representor No: PRS01898 Representation ID: REP04071

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: S Sharma

Representor No: PRS01898 Representation ID: REP04071

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: S Sharma

Representor No: PRS01898 Representation ID: REP04071

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: S Sharma

Representor No: PRS01898 **Representation ID:** REP04071

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: V Sharma

Representor No: PRS02234 **Representation ID:** REP04473

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: T D Sharples

Representor No: PRS01903 Representation ID: REP04076

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: T D Sharples

Representor No: PRS01903 Representation ID: REP04076

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: T D Sharples

Representor No: PRS01903 **Representation ID:** REP04076

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: T D Sharples

Representor No: PRS01903 Representation ID: REP04076

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: T D Sharples

Representor No: PRS01903 Representation ID: REP04076

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: T D Sharples

Representor No: PRS01903 **Representation ID:** REP04076

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: M Shaw

Representor No: PRS01049 Representation ID: REP03111

Question Ref: H7

3327, 3328, 3330, 3034 - I am writing with regard to Land near Layton Rd/Bayton Lane/West End Lane Horsforth, Sites 3327/28/30 and 3034. I agree with the classification of these sites that area is not suitable for the allocation of housing.

I have various reasons which support this opinion, but the main reason is the unsuitability of the highways and access in the surrounding area. The main destination for the majority of the traffic is the A65. West End Lane is already a 'rat run' for a number of users and increased airport traffic, despite it only being a (sometimes narrow) residential road (local councillors have already discussed traffic calming measures to reduce these problems).

The junction with West End Lane/Layton Rd/Bayton Lane is an accident blackspot, and any possible increase in vehicle numbers within this area can only serve to exacerbate these issues.

North Comments

Name: Lynsey Shaw

Representor No: PRS02451 **Representation ID:** REP04714

Question Ref: H1

1199 – Moseley Bottom, Green to Red. Agree Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Too few good schools and this would affect my child getting into our first choice.

Agree the inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Lots of parking in and around Cookridge already making roads difficult to navigate and dangerous at times this would increase.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Yes schools will struggle anyway with high birth rate last few years. Already around 30 kids in the area being born a month. Affects baby clinic services too.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Yes where will this water go? My house? My street? Road I want to access ?

Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Yes it should be protected.

North Comments

Name: Eileen Shaw

Representor No: PRS03555 **Representation ID:** REP01933

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I can understand most of the reasons put forward for the use of the green sites. These involve quite a lot of green belt, but in my opinion they are closer to Leeds and as such would not add to the traffic congestion until we get further down the A65.

Question Ref: H3

2038 is coded amber, but is Brownfield. The fact that it would require remedial works before a residential use could be considered should not make so much difference. Surely the profit margins of the builders aren't the issue here. Brownfield should be considered before any scrap of greenbelt is used. After all Brownfield has already been developed, but once built on you will never get green belt back.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: H6

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H8

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H9

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

North Comments

Name: Eileen Shaw

Representor No: PRS03555 **Representation ID:** REP01933

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area. I have submitted them as my own, as I agree with them entirely [x]

North Comments

Name: Christopher Shaw

Representor No: PRS03926 Representation ID: REP00375

Question Ref: G1

I have concern that the reduction in greenspace sets a precedent and will be further eroded in years to come. I believe the priority should be in reconditioning empty housing stock and brownfield sites before giving up our greenspace.

Question Ref: G2

n

Question Ref: G2

This is an opportunity to set Leeds apart from other areas in protecting our greenspace for the enjoyment of current and future generations.

Question Ref: G3

n

Question Ref: G4

y

Question Ref: G5

y

Question Ref: G6

y

Question Ref: CCG1

n

Question Ref: CCG2

n

Question Ref: G8

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G9

Released for housing

Question Ref: G10

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G11

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G12

Released for housing

Question Ref: G13

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G14

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G15

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G16

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G17

Retained for greenspace

North Comments

Name: Christopher Shaw

Representor No: PRS03926 **Representation ID:** REP00375

Question Ref: G18

Released for housing

Question Ref: G19

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G20

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G9

0

Question Ref: G10

0

North Comments

Name: Alan Shaw

Representor No: PRS05661 **Representation ID:** REP06325

Question Ref: H7

I would like it to be known that i disagree with any planning permission to build houses on this land. This is an area of beauty and to build houses would be a crime. I walk my dogs in this area all through the summer months bluebell woods are beautiful in summer. So please leave the woods alone. And looking back through history people were buried alive in this area when they were opencast mines there many years ago.

North Comments

Name: Paul Shaw

Representor No: PRS05667 **Representation ID:** REP06332

Question Ref: H7

The site is not suitable for the allocation of housing. I feel very strongly about this proposal as outwood lane is busy enough without traffic from another 121 houses, there is not enough green belt land as is it without keep building on them. Also the schooling situation in horsforth is bad to begin with out building more houses in the area. Also that area is ideal for children to play.

North Comments

Name: B Sheard

Representor No: PRS02479 Representation ID: REP04746

Question Ref: H1

I am writing to register my opposition to the potential development of The Paddock Church Lane Meanwood for 25 New Built Houses. Having lived in Meanwood for over 30 years I have witnessed the loss of green area upon green area along Church Lane culminating in the new housing estates on what was the scenic grounds of Meanwood Learning Disability Hospital. The above site marked as green on your forward planning site as having the greatest potential to be allocated for housing would mean the loss of one of the few remaining green areas of Meanwood resulting in the area becoming one big housing estate. I appreciate that Meanwood Park is a beautiful green area, but for the elderly like myself (I am nearly 83 years old) who aren't particularly mobile, it is hardly accessible down the steep incline of Church Lane, whereas the above green site is. I would also like to point out that I can envisage serious traffic problems if the development goes ahead. The Police already periodically have speed traps midway down Church Lane, to discourage drivers speeding down the incline of Church Lane towards the junction at the bottom with Green Road. To make matters worse, this is also over the brow of the hill of Church Lane where drivers are blind to what's occurring ahead. I dread to think of the possible consequences of having a road exiting and entering Church Lane from a new road serving a new housing estate. This in my opinion would be extremely hazardous

North Comments

Name: Christopher Sheppard

Representor No: PRS03739 **Representation ID:** REP01610

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Other brownfield sites would be most suitable

Question Ref: H2

All for the reason above

Question Ref: H3

No

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

2130 Church LaneCurrent development by this site is undermining the area by the grade 1 listed church. The density of housing is excessive and the uniformity of design and materials is too great. Existing houses in the area have far more variety and far more space around them. More of the same will be a disaster for this conservation area. It has similar significance to green belt at the northern boundary of Leeds.

Question Ref: H5

2130 church lane - see previous answer

Question Ref: H6

No

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H9

2130 Church LaneCurrent development by this site is undermining the area by the grade 1 listed church. The density of housing is excessive and the uniformity of design and materials is too great. Existing houses in the area have far more variety and far more space around them. More of the same will be a disaster for this conservation area. It has similar significance to red coded green belt at the northern boundary of Leeds.

Question Ref: H11

I believe the former Bodington Hall site offers ample development potential in this area

North Comments

Name: Lynsey Shields

Representor No: PRS02431 **Representation ID:** REP04692

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree Existing developments are not fully sold, if people wanted to live in the area that much they would buy the already built properties The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree We already struggle leaving our estate due to the traffic on Otley Old Road. This will cause further delays and increased traffic already around Ireland Wood Primary School Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree Despite the new surgery at Ireland Wood, it is normal to wait a week for a suitable appointment. We are unable to get a dentist as it is. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Goes without saying, increased tarmac and buildings equals less ground for water to saturate thus increased levels in flooding. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree We are lucky to live so close to the countryside why spoil it. I am sure the increased number of flights around Leeds have impacted the wildlife -why increase the damage

North Comments

Name: Richard Shields

Representor No: PRS02432 **Representation ID:** REP04693

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Traffic is already congested around Otley Old Road and Horsforth train station, any more traffic would see this pushed to gridlock on most mornings and evenings Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree I am still on the waiting list for a Dentist in Horsforth, an additional 200 homes would further compound this issue The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree The loss of land for water absorbtion in this area is likely to cause serious flooding further into this railtrack Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree One of the benefits to living in Cookridge is that you are a short walk from fields and wildlife. This development will cause serious damage to the wildlife in the area if approved.

North Comments

Name: Andy Shipman

Representor No: PRS04273 Representation ID: REP01377

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

It is essential that green belt land is preserved as much as possible to restrict the inexorable sprawl of built up areas and to preserve "green spaces" to boost the wellbeing of all those who live nearby. As per the recent study by the European Centre for Environment & Human Health [1] it has been proven that green spaces improve quality of life, especially for those in urban areas. Coupled with the stated aims of the green belt to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another I strongly disagree that several of these sites represent the most suitable sites to allocate for future housing development.[1] <http://www.ecehh.org/publication/would-you-be-happier-living-greener-urban-area>

Question Ref: H2

4095: Land to the West of Knott lane I disagree with the allocation of this site as it is fields like this one that are particularly obvious examples of green belt reducing urban sprawl. As you travel westwards along the A65 from Horsforth this field, among others, plays a large part in breaking up the sprawl of existing industrial developments to the south of the A65, such as Airedale International and John Penny's abattoir. It also helps provide views across the valley and the perception of a more open countryside and a "green corridor" between Horsforth and Rawdon.

3331: Land at Knott lane/Layton lane I disagree with the allocation of this site for similar reasons. South of the A65 from Horsforth maintains an open aspect that would be significantly reduced with the addition of housing in this field. This part of green-belt also helps break up the stretch of land from the crematorium along to the Airedale factory. In my opinion any further development to the South of the A65 would contribute to a more enclosed aspect and would encourage the sprawl of existing industrial and residential developments. By leaving these two sites green, along with any other sites to the south of A65, we can safeguard Horsforth and Rawdon from merging together. 3329: Land to the rear of 22-66, Layton Lane, Rawdon I disagree with the allocation of this site because of the obvious encroachment into the existing countryside. One of the enjoyable aspects of living in Rawdon is the easy access to pleasant countryside via the abundant footpaths and the Leeds Country Way. Developing this site would constitute a very visible and obvious reduction to the local countryside as well as encroaching on these footpaths. Also, for all of the above sites, there would be an inevitable, direct increase to the levels of traffic on the A65 and the attendant increase of noise and pollution that goes with it. Coupled with the extra traffic from nearby new housing developments - such as the Clariant site and the Wellroyd mill - this will put an increased strain on an already over-utilised route out of Leeds. Also, much of the local infrastructure - such as Rawdon St. Peter's primary school and Town Street, Rawdon - are already at capacity and these developments would inevitably overburden them.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

3034: Rawdon Billing The Billing is a local landmark that represents all that is good about the green-belt policy. Any housing built on the billing would represent a huge increase to the sprawl of built-up areas. It is a fabulous local piece of countryside that provides all the benefits associated with a "green space".

North Comments

Name: Trevor,anne Shoesmith

Representor No: PRS05728 **Representation ID:** REP06400

Question Ref: H1

my husband and i wish to protest about the development of new houses at moseleywood bottoms destroying wild life also causing mayam on moseleywood gardens road where we live as it is congested now already with cars parked on road

North Comments

Name: Jean Shuttleworth

Representor No: PRS06343 Representation ID: REP07308

Question Ref: H1

Hello

This email is to confirm my objection against the proposed development of 25 houses on the Paddock, Church Ln, Meanwood/Moortown 1242.

This development is not tenable in that the local infrastructure - the access to and from Church Lane and the increased volume of traffic which would result on Church Lane (which is overloaded now) - cannot support it.

Also this area is a green haven for foxes, hedgehogs and all other manner of wildlife and meadow wild flowers and should be a 'conservation area'.

It is also an area of outstanding beauty and again I request it be conserved as such for the enjoyment of us and future generations.

I lodge my sincere objection against this development.

North Comments

Name: K Siari

Representor No: PRS01786 **Representation ID:** REP03948

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: K Siari

Representor No: PRS01786 Representation ID: REP03948

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: K Siari

Representor No: PRS01786 Representation ID: REP03948

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development

North Comments

Name: K Siari

Representor No: PRS01786 **Representation ID:** REP03948

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: K Siari

Representor No: PRS01786 Representation ID: REP03948

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: K Siari

Representor No: PRS01786 Representation ID: REP03948

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: K Siari

Representor No: PRS01786 **Representation ID:** REP03948

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Susan Siari

Representor No: PRS01792 **Representation ID:** REP03955

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Susan Siari

Representor No: PRS01792 Representation ID: REP03955

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Susan Siari

Representor No: PRS01792 Representation ID: REP03955

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Susan Siari

Representor No: PRS01792 **Representation ID:** REP03955

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Susan Siari

Representor No: PRS01792 Representation ID: REP03955

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Susan Siari

Representor No: PRS01792 Representation ID: REP03955

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Susan Siari

Representor No: PRS01792 **Representation ID:** REP03955

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Natasha Siari

Representor No: PRS01878 Representation ID: REP04038

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Natasha Siari

Representor No: PRS01878 Representation ID: REP04038

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Natasha Siari

Representor No: PRS01878 **Representation ID:** REP04038

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Natasha Siari

Representor No: PRS01878 Representation ID: REP04038

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Natasha Siari

Representor No: PRS01878 Representation ID: REP04038

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Natasha Siari

Representor No: PRS01878 **Representation ID:** REP04038

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Kate Siddall

Representor No: PRS05268 Representation ID: REP05863

Question Ref: H4

We are concerned about the classification of site 1202 as being suitable for 185 properties. Our concerns are:

1. The Horsforth schools are already full. Will the developers pay for school expansions?
2. 185 houses means 370 cars. Access to the A65 is already difficult, and no new access is possible.
3. Water pressure in the Victorias is poor. Will the supply be reinforced in any way?
4. Can the local sewage treatment plant cope with more households?

Yours faithfully

[x]

North Comments

Name: Timothy Silburn

Representor No: PRS02206 Representation ID: REP04438

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The infrastructure will not cope with it nore is the land behind Cookridge avenue fit for building, I strongly object to this proposal. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. The access roads & buses will not cope with the increases in usage. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Theses services can only just cope now. So they will be overwhelmed. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree.this spears for itself as Cookridge is built on a flood plain. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. As a wildlife lover Moseley Woods are a haven to this cause. I have seen the deer here on many occasions.

North Comments

Name: Karen Simkins

Representor No: PRS01981 **Representation ID:** REP04173

Question Ref: G17

I strongly believe that these allotments should be kept as green space and not developed.

North Comments

Name: Adrian Simmons

Representor No: PRS00030 Representation ID: REP00436

Question Ref: H1

1299A Problems with this site:

1. Difficulties providing medical and schooling facilities.
2. Peak hour traffic problems increasing congestion already problematic through Adel Lane, Otley Road, Ring Road and through already congested Headingley. I object to the development.

Question Ref: H1

1033 - Problems with this site: 1. Difficulties providing medical and schooling facilities. 2. Peak flow traffic problems increasing congestion down Otley Road, Adel Lane and the ring road with knock on difficulties through already congested Headingley. I object to the development.

Question Ref: H4

2130 - No: should be changed from amber to red. There are problems with the economic, environmental and social sustainability. There will be difficulties providing medical and schooling facilities. There are severe highways issues and in particular peak time traffic problems. The development is a major assault on the visual aspects looking both from and towards the church (Adel church). It is well known that the site is subject to flooding.

North Comments

Name: Susan Simmons

Representor No: PRS00032 **Representation ID:** REP00438

Question Ref: H1

1033 - I object to the development - More congestion on the roads. There are no places for schools and medical services. There will be impact on public transport and the roads being much more congested.

Question Ref: H1

1299A - There will be significant peak time traffic problems with the greater volume of traffic adding to the volume of traffic already existing. Access to site, will it go straight through leading to more problems on Otley Road and Church Lane. I object to the development.

Question Ref: H4

2130 - Should be changed to red from amber. There are problems with economic and enviromental and social sustainability. There must be more infrastructure of medical and schooling facilities.

North Comments

Name: Orpheus Simon

Representor No: PRS04178 **Representation ID:** REP01328

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I can understand most of the reasons put forward for the use of the green sites. These involve quite a lot of green belt, but in my opinion they are closer to Leeds and as such would not add to the traffic congestion until we get further down the A65

Question Ref: H3

2038 is coded amber, but is brownfield. The fact that it would require remedial works before a residential use could be considered should not make so much difference. Surely the profit margins of the builders aren't the issue here. Brownfield should be considered before any scrap of greenbelt is used. After all brownfield has already been developed, but once built on you will never get green belt back.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: H6

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H8

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H9

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

North Comments

Name: Orpheus Simon

Representor No: PRS04178 **Representation ID:** REP01328

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area. I have submitted them as my own, as I agree with them entirely. Orpheus Simon

North Comments

Name: Jean Simon

Representor No: PRS04747 **Representation ID:** REP01329

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I can understand most of the reasons put forward for the use of the green sites. These involve quite a lot of green belt, but in my opinion they are closer to Leeds and as such would not add to the traffic congestion until we get further down the A65

Question Ref: H3

2038 is coded amber, but is brownfield. The fact that it would require remedial works before a residential use could be considered should not make so much difference. Surely the profit margins of the builders aren't the issue here. Brownfield should be considered before any scrap of greenbelt is used. After all brownfield has already been developed, but once built on you will never get green belt back.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: H6

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H8

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H9

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

North Comments

Name: Jean Simon

Representor No: PRS04747 **Representation ID:** REP01329

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area. I have submitted them as my own, as I agree with them entirely.

North Comments

Name: James Simpson

Representor No: PRS01542 **Representation ID:** REP03683

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Strongly agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Petere Simpson

Representor No: PRS02012 **Representation ID:** REP04211

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly Agree We need to keep our countryside intact. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly Agree Our roads are overcrowded as it is and this will be unfair on local residents. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly Agree Too many schools are already overcrowded and health services etc are stretched. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Agree with the introduction of more houses this beck will be prone to damning. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly Agree we need to look after our wildlife not drive them out.

North Comments

Name: Francis Simpson

Representor No: PRS02155 **Representation ID:** REP04377

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat strongly agree we need more not less!!.

North Comments

Name: Kathleen Simpson

Representor No: PRS05029 **Representation ID:** REP05595

Question Ref: H1

1199 - The area regular has problems with flooding. Extra swathes of concrete buildings, roads , drives etc. will only add to the problem. Access to the site on Mosley Wood Rise will be severely congested, causing neighbouring streets to be used as rat runs. These narrow streets will have to take heavy building vehicles during construction to the site which will mean years of chaos and disruption to the area. A large proportion of housing in the area consists of bungalows occupied by the elderly. They will find the increase in traffic to the street especially during construction work not only disruptive but dangerous.

Green Lane, Tinshill Road and Woodhill Road are already jammed with traffic, more so during peak times and not helped by cars parked along these streets, often reducing the roads t single line traffic only.

North Comments

Name: Alison Sinclair

Representor No: PRS04202 **Representation ID:** REP00622

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Site ref nos 1033, 1178a, 1299a, Concern that the local infrastructure for highways , schools , medical facilities is inadequate to support proposed number of new dwellings

Question Ref: H2

As above

Question Ref: H3

no

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

ref 2130: Concern that Church Lane is inadequate to support increased traffic volume. Inadequate local community infrastructure. Threat to Site local heritage and effect on greens pace and natural beauty. Continuous building will erode the individual character of the local area.

Question Ref: H6

no

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Site ref nos 1079, 2052, 1178b, 1243, 1246, 3034, 3360 All these sites should remain unsuitable. Access is a major issue especially 1243 and 1079 - There is a primary school and limited pavement (with some historical heritage) to Long Causeway. 2052: unsuitable due to access and traffic problems into Tile Lane again passing a Primary School where limited parking is currently an issue, giving rise to safety concerns.

Question Ref: H11

Depends on increasing the local infrastructure to support a larger population across all age ranges eg transport, schools and medical facilities. Type of dwelling being considered is important as there is a recognised need for smaller dwellings to enable an ageing population to remain in the Adel community.

Question Ref: H12

no

Question Ref: H14

Yes, locations on bus routes and near local amenities ie 1033, 1299a

Question Ref: H15

no

Question Ref: General comment

The plan to build predominantly large family houses inevitably will lead to an increase in traffic, will impact on already oversubscribed local schools, and will diminish the quality of life for all concerned. A proper review of what is needed in Adel should be undertaken and should include recreation facilities, education establishments and road links. I would support the use of brownfield sites as a first consideration

North Comments

Name: Peter Singleton

Representor No: PRS02341 **Representation ID:** REP04592

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Agree The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect thi sAgree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Agree

North Comments

Name: Ian Sissling

Representor No: PRS03753 **Representation ID:** REP00665

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

It appears from the green sites proposed that over half the houses proposed for NWL will be built in Otley. This disproportion is not justifiable. Otley does not have the infrastructure to cope with such an increase. Furthermore it's road and rail links to Leeds and Bradford (the main commuter destinations) are overstretched already.

Question Ref: H2

Site 745 East of OtleyThe LDF schedule of sites does not contain details of the sites which are carried forward from the previous UDP. Also the requirements that the proposed Eastern bypass is built and that traffic only accesses and leaves the new development via this road, are not stipulated in the Site allocation plan. These issues need to be addressed. There should be a planning framework in place which the public are consulted.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H6

Site 2051b This is near Leeds City centre and has good transport links with little congestion as compared to OTLEY. fURTHER; THIS SITE has clear bouderies of woodland and golf courses.The necessary infrastructure for schooling and health services already exist.Site 2054This site already has an access point to the A61 at the Leeds Grammer School roundabout.As with 2051b it has clear boundaries and shares all the benefits of 2051b

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

see my response to question H6

Question Ref: H8

Sites 2051b and 2054 should be classified Amber. See H6

North Comments

Name: Stuart Skaife

Representor No: PRS02371 **Representation ID:** REP04623

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree Lack of support services - schools-Drs etcThe inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Traffic in this area is already a problem Further development will lead to increased accident potential Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree School places are already at a premium The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Janet Skaife

Representor No: PRS05697 **Representation ID:** REP06361

Question Ref: H7

I attended the consultation at Horsforth School concerning the overall development plan for Leeds. I would like to comment on the above site and am in agreement with the opinion of Horsforth residents that the site is not suitable for development due to the problems of access via Outwood Lane and environmental concerns. These issues were considered by the Council Planning Officers when refusing planning consent which is the subject of an appeal by Redrow Homes

North Comments

Name: Gladys Evelyn Slack

Representor No: PRS02165 **Representation ID:** REP04390

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom - Green to Red.

Cookridge needs no more housing developments.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem

Local schools such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat

North Comments

Name: Gladys Evelyn Slack

Representor No: PRS02165 **Representation ID:** REP04393

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom - Green to Red.

Cookridge needs no more housing developments.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem

Local schools such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat

North Comments

Name: Sandra Carol Slater

Representor No: PRS01024 Representation ID: REP03080

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

Cookridge is already over developed. Parking is a problem now.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

Will be big problem for traffic and parking.

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

Schools over subscribed as it is.

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

Has been flood in the railways.

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

Wildlife is important it preserves the countryside.

North Comments

Name: Deborah Slater

Representor No: PRS02597 Representation ID: REP04884

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Deborah Slater

Representor No: PRS02597 Representation ID: REP04884

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Deborah Slater

Representor No: PRS02597 Representation ID: REP04884

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Deborah Slater

Representor No: PRS02597 Representation ID: REP04884

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Deborah Slater

Representor No: PRS02597 Representation ID: REP04884

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Deborah Slater

Representor No: PRS02597 **Representation ID:** REP04884

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Michael Smaldon

Representor No: PRS01075 **Representation ID:** REP03141

Question Ref: H7

3034, 3328, 3327, 3330 - We write to confirm that we are in agreement with Leeds City Council's classification of these sites as 'considered not suitable for allocation of housing'.

As living adjacent to all four sites referred to, I have concern in relation to the overdevelopment of this area in considering the capacity and number of dwellings proposed for the sites, which will be detrimental to the character of the area, and will cause significant problems of access and egress particularly on Bayton Lane, which is already a bottleneck point at its junction with Layton Road and Brownberrie Lane.

Additionally, the junction of Bayton Lane, Layton Road/Brownberrie Lane and West End Lane has been a point of many severe accidents over the years, and there would scarcely be one week when there is not an incident of some sort at this point. On account of the complexity of the crossroads, these accidents usually involve more than two vehicles; unconnected vehicles become involved on account of the speed of vehicles, and their close proximity on narrow roads.

If one can speak of accidents as everyday occurrences, Bayton Lane itself has also been witness to some horrific incidents involving the death and serious injury of significant numbers over the years, and I have brought this to the attention of the Council and the Police. An increase in vehicular movements from proposed new properties would on account of the social economy of the area, be significantly greater than the average, hence enhancing the problems, and any vehicle joining Bayton Lane which is a derestricted road will simply be another accident opportunity.

Finally the area has been one much enjoyed by the local population on the edge of green belt. It could be reasonably suggested that I have a NIMBY approach to this because my personal environment will be affected, but I do believe that this area is very much to the benefit of all who live in the area, and housing developments on the scale proposed will adversely affect the character of the area. There may be a case for a small number of carefully selected properties being used as infill points provided the character and quality of the area is carefully nurtured.

Finally, the local institutional infrastructure does not exist to support this level of potential development; local schools particularly are even currently exceeding capacity to take all already local in the area.

We therefore agree with the Council's designation as not suitable for the allocation of housing.

North Comments

Name: Sandra Smaldon

Representor No: PRS01208 **Representation ID:** REP03310

Question Ref: H7

3034, 3327, 3328, 3330 - : 3327 agree. Not suitable for allocation of housing.3328 agree. Not suitable for allocation of housing. 3330 agree. Not suitable for allocation of housing. 3034 agree. Not suitable for allocation of housing.

North Comments

Name: V Smith

Representor No: PRS00641 **Representation ID:** REP03423

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Lisa Smith

Representor No: PRS00863 **Representation ID:** REP02881

Question Ref: H1

1199 - No - See the next question for the main reasons.

Question Ref: H2

1199 - Comments

- A housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic.
- We do not have the infrastructure to cope with the extra traffic.
- Moseley Wood Gardens has a concrete base. A cosmetic layer of tarmac is periodically applied. Extra traffic will have an impact. Streets will require constant attention. Heavy plant used during site construction will create further damage to the concrete base.
- Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times. That situation will worsen substantially with the new development.
- Commuters from Harrogate, Otley and outlying areas use Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route. Additional local traffic from a new estate will add to the problems.
- The development will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. Traffic from a new development will add substantially to the winter chaos. Roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Cookridge in winter months.
- The area will attract less people with the increased difficulties in navigating to and from Cookridge.
- The development will impact on the local schools. School places will become an issue.
- Parking is problematic and dangerous outside of the local school, Tesco and Post Office. Road safety is of prime concern. The problems will worsen with a new development. Residents are severely affected by the current situation.
- The train service is questionable. A minimum number of carriages are provided at peak times. Parking at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate for local people. Commuters travel by car from outside Leeds, park their cars on the streets around the station, and use the local train. Extra housing will compound the problems.
- There is concern over the inadequacy of the current public transport system in the area and there is poor connectivity to a number of locations in the city. As a result of this issue and a number of others this development would neither be environmentally or socially sustainable.
- Flooding may become a problem to the railway line from surface run off, causing delays.
- The countryside adjacent to Cookridge will be destroyed along with the ecology.

North Comments

Name: David Smith

Representor No: PRS00864 Representation ID: REP02882

Question Ref: H1

1199 - No - See the next question for the main reasons.

Question Ref: H2

1199 - Comments

- A housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic.
- We do not have the infrastructure to cope with the extra traffic.
- Moseley Wood Gardens has a concrete base. A cosmetic layer of tarmac is periodically applied. Extra traffic will have an impact. Streets will require constant attention. Heavy plant used during site construction will create further damage to the concrete base.
- Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times. That situation will worsen substantially with the new development.
- Commuters from Harrogate, Otley and outlying areas use Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route. Additional local traffic from a new estate will add to the problems.
- The development will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. Traffic from a new development will add substantially to the winter chaos. Roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Cookridge in winter months.
- The area will attract less people with the increased difficulties in navigating to and from Cookridge.
- The development will impact on the local schools. School places will become an issue.
- Parking is problematic and dangerous outside of the local school, Tesco and Post Office. Road safety is of prime concern. The problems will worsen with a new development. Residents are severely affected by the current situation.
- The train service is questionable. A minimum number of carriages are provided at peak times. Parking at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate for local people. Commuters travel by car from outside Leeds, park their cars on the streets around the station, and use the local train. Extra housing will compound the problems.
- There is concern over the inadequacy of the current public transport system in the area and there is poor connectivity to a number of locations in the city. As a result of this issue and a number of others this development would neither be environmentally or socially sustainable.
- Flooding may become a problem to the railway line from surface run off, causing delays.
- The countryside adjacent to Cookridge will be destroyed along with the ecology.

North Comments

Name: Jacqueline Smith

Representor No: PRS00932 **Representation ID:** REP02969

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

Other potential brownfield sites must be identified.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

The roads are too narrow & with only one netry/ exit to the proposed site it is utter nonesense to develop.

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

Local residents are already unable to secure places for children at local schools & dentist lists are full.

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

The area is predominantly heavy soil and clay with streams which flood anyway.

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

Many species of birds/insects/non phibians can be found and we must protect them for furture generations.

North Comments

Name: James Smith

Representor No: PRS01184 Representation ID: REP03282

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Mark Smith

Representor No: PRS01186 **Representation ID:** REP03284

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Susan Smith

Representor No: PRS01189 **Representation ID:** REP03287

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Rachel Smith

Representor No: PRS01192 **Representation ID:** REP03288

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Beatrice Smith

Representor No: PRS01193 **Representation ID:** REP03289

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree. Children living in cookridge can no longer qualify for schools in horsforth. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Traffic using the Bridge over the Train Line will be more chaotic early morning. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. Infrastructure especially school places are over subscribed already. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. Where will the water go when flooding does occur. More building will affect this Strongly agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree. Local deer have been seen in this area.

North Comments

Name: Kim Smith

Representor No: PRS01245 **Representation ID:** REP03348

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. This area should be returned to green belt status, and all brownfield sites should be used as priority. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local road will be used as 'Rat Run' to the entrance proposed on Moseley Wood Rise. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The local schools are full this year with some children who live close to Holy Trinity have been refused a place. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Rhonda Smith

Representor No: PRS01246 **Representation ID:** REP03350

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. If anything, Cookridge nees affordable renting. Please use brownfield sites. Not our green spaces. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. The last thing Coodridge needs is more cars, Rat Running through the Moseley Woods especially the rise and the bank traffic at rush hours already bottleneckss over the station. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. My daughter did not get a place at Holy Trinity due to over subscription, we live only 0.3 mile away. Where will the children from 200 new houses goto school? The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. The Horsforth train line often flood already, more housing will create more "run off" and hence more flooding. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. We can never have this land back, we have seen foxes and roe deer in our local area, and habitats should be protected.

North Comments

Name: Kenneth Smith

Representor No: PRS01248 **Representation ID:** REP03352

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The present road system was designed and built proportionate to the existing houses and modes of transport. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Cookridge itself has a poor road system restricted by narrow bridge on one side and very heavy use on the other into Leeds City. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Schools in this area cannot cope with current demand, locals cannot get entry!. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Agree.

North Comments

Name: Jessica Smith

Representor No: PRS01253 **Representation ID:** REP03357

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Jessica Smith

Representor No: PRS01253 **Representation ID:** REP04506

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Jonathan Smith

Representor No: PRS01326 Representation ID: REP03436

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments- Strongly agree. I grew up in Cookridge and have memories of growing up and don't want to be repatriated

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem- Strongly agree. Enough road users at present

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly Agree.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this- Agree.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree. Don't want to disturb the natural habitat, should be left untouched.

North Comments

Name: Rj Smith

Representor No: PRS01555 Representation ID: REP03699

Question Ref: H7

3327, 3328, 3330, 3034 - I write to advise you that in relation to potential housing sites numbered 3327, 3328, 3330 and 3034 - 'Land near Layton Road/Bayton Lane/West End Lane, Horsforth' - I AGREE with the classification of these sites as NOT SUITABLE FOR THE ALLOCATION OF HOUSING.

In support of my opinion I would mention that the highways access to all these sites is very poor and any significant development would have major adverse implications in this respect for the community and traffic flows generally in the area.. Also this land is generally farmed and the loss of this agricultural land would be a significant loss for both the community and agriculture.

North Comments

Name: J Smith

Representor No: PRS01595 **Representation ID:** REP03746

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly Agree over crowding & heavy traffic. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly Agree. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly Agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Strongly Agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly Agree.

North Comments

Name: Sarla Smith

Representor No: PRS01684 **Representation ID:** REP03835

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Bulding on this site would put a huge strain on the little community facilities/services available and add to traffic congestion. Borwn field sites must be priority before any other sites are cosidered. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Road safety is on prime concern. Potentially adding 400 cars the estate will experience significant conjections. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. 200 more household/400 more possible children, school are already oversubscribed as are dentists and doctors. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Properties in Moseley woods will become prone to more frequest flooding as will the railway lines. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Destruction of habitats to wild life would be inevitable and the consequences disasterous and should not under any circumstances be allowed.

North Comments

Name: Ben Smith

Representor No: PRS01687 Representation ID: REP03844

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Council should fill empty houses before building a new ones. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Increased traffic will cause extra damage to roads which already experience high level of traffic. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Local School do not have the facilities to increase staffing level growing clas sizes only creates further problems. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Underground springs in the area mean that even small scale buiding will be very difficult. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. The wildilfe in the Cookridge is not suitable for new residents removing it will mean many new houses dont get filled.

North Comments

Name: Samuel Smith

Representor No: PRS01693 **Representation ID:** REP03847

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Although I appreciate the need for new housing, building on green field is not the answer. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Roads on the area are prone to wear increasing traffic will require either Council investment or poor quality road ways. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Schools in the area have frequently faced threat of closure. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Although serious flooding is more, burst of rain do cause damage. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. I would rather see more environmental investment in the area.

North Comments

Name: Alexandra Smith

Representor No: PRS01711 Representation ID: REP03869

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments- Strongly agree.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem- Strongly agree.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly Agree.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this- Strongly agree.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Rosanna Smith

Representor No: PRS02136 Representation ID: REP04357

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Infrastructure will not support more housing. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Roads are not very wide and parked cars can be a problem now. Also busy traffic morning and evening. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Already have long wait for appointment. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. The beck can flood by a few feet with heavy rain and the field is very boggy in many parts. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Various birds, foxes and occasional deer have been sighted in the field.

North Comments

Name: Terry Smith

Representor No: PRS02145 **Representation ID:** REP04367

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. I have to go to Horsforth for Doctor cantake over a week to get appointment here. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. It is't a little beck when it rains heavily it s a raging torrent.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. I watched the fox cobs playing quite often.

North Comments

Name: A.r Smith

Representor No: PRS02156 **Representation ID:** REP04378

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree I agree with all the objections stated The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Bernard Smith

Representor No: PRS02176 Representation ID: REP04405

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree Overcrowding roads and schools The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Overcrowded at present moment Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: D.r Smith

Representor No: PRS02221 **Representation ID:** REP04455

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The area is saturated already the infrastructure cannot sustain further housing. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Roads are already dangerous for children without potentially 400 more vehicles. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Dentals & Schools are already over subscribed. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Cookridge is buld on clay with many underground streams flooding is inevitable. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Difficult to say without more research however. Frogs, toads & newts in addition to importand insects and birds would be disturbed.

North Comments

Name: Jason Smith

Representor No: PRS02297 Representation ID: REP04541

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom Green to Red. Strongly agree Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

North Comments

Name: Ellen Smith

Representor No: PRS02360 **Representation ID:** REP04611

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree The area is already densely populated and local infrastructure such as schools will suffer and are not suitable for expansion to accommodate this population increase. Congestion will increase to an unacceptable level with certain residential areas becoming 'rat runs' making them less safe for children and pets. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: J Smith

Representor No: PRS02421 Representation ID: REP04682

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: J Smith

Representor No: PRS02421 Representation ID: REP04682

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: J Smith

Representor No: PRS02421 Representation ID: REP04682

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: J Smith

Representor No: PRS02421 **Representation ID:** REP04682

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: J Smith

Representor No: PRS02421 Representation ID: REP04682

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: J Smith

Representor No: PRS02421 Representation ID: REP04682

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in not way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: J Smith

Representor No: PRS02421 Representation ID: REP04682

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Colin Smith

Representor No: PRS03963 **Representation ID:** REP01119

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

The sites specified below all encroach on Green Belt and add to the existing urban sprawl along the Aire Valley. There is already substantial development along the A65 corridor with the planned sites at Kirkstall Forge and Sandoz and these will impact negatively on this area. Recent major development has also taken place in Guiseley and Menston adding to the major issues with the current infrastructure provision in this area, especially at rush hour and any further development will exacerbate them. Improving the transport network will spoil the area and its communities as well as encouraging even more commuting, all unsustainable in the long run.

Question Ref: H2

3329, 3331, 4095 all encroach on greenbelt land and act as infill as well as the reasons above applying. 3327, 3328 and 3330 are all on the map but not in the list, but I object to these for the same reasons. 3366 seems less of an intrusion, but still is more load on the infrastructure.

Question Ref: H3

No

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

3033, 1104 and 2162 because all encroach on rural land on the edge of the Aire Valley.

Question Ref: H6

?

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

All shaded red

Question Ref: H9

All designated as Greenbelt

Question Ref: H10

?

Question Ref: H11

Only the brownfield sites should be developed e.g. 4019

Question Ref: H12

No

Question Ref: H13

Don't know

Question Ref: H14

Many of these sites are on hilly ground and currently are distant from amenities so are unsuitable.

Question Ref: General comment

This form is unclear, repetitive, appears designed to put off anyone who might comment on the proposals. It assumes a comprehensive and detailed knowledge of all the possible sites in the particular area, which most respondents will not have. The maps are small and difficult to see, even on a large monitor and do not print well. Not a good example of an accessible document

North Comments

Name: Thomas Richard Smith

Representor No: PRS03970 **Representation ID:** REP01322

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

I agree with the decision that the classification of Site 1015 - Hunger Hills, south of Lee Lane West - IS NOT CONSIDERED SUITABLE FOR THE ALLOCATION OF HOUSING.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Site 1015 is not suitable for housing because of highway access difficulties; existing pressures on infrastructures and schools and the preservation of a wonderful local green space.

North Comments

Name: Sue Smith

Representor No: PRS04180 Representation ID: REP01004

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Ref 3360 Cookridge Hall & Golf CourseThe area provides valuable green space between two densely built up areas in Holt Park & Cookridge. There is public access to the site via long established rights of way. Building on the site would result in loss of this much appreciated open space, damage to wildlife, & loss of recreational space in this area of North West Leeds.

Question Ref: General comment

The presentation of the consultation process on line is been confused & complicated. It is not conducive to the democratic process of commenting on plans which could potentially have a huge impact on people who live close to possible developments.

North Comments

Name: Vanessa Smith

Representor No: PRS04828 **Representation ID:** REP01343

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Some of the sites identified as Green have important ecological benefits, and as green/natural spaces - they enhance and make the character of the neighbourhood/area.

Question Ref: H2

Site ref: 1199 Moseley Wood Bottom This field is an excellent wildlife habitat, and should not be built on. This important green space, provides an important feeding ground for birds and bats, and is home to lots of wildlife. This natural field is very important to the character of the neighbourhood. A development here would completely alter and spoil the quiet countryside character of this corner of Cookridge. This area is green belt - whether it has been classified as PAS or not, it is still a green belt site. I have concerns regarding the impact to local schools, doctors and road networks - all of which are under strain already.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

North Comments

Name: J Smith

Representor No: PRS04989 Representation ID: REP01903

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H3

YesSite reference:1202Reason:We consider that this site is one of the most suitable sites for housing development and should therefore be identified as green. The site is well related to the existing urban area and is close to shops and services, community and leisure facilities, public transport, education and local health facilities. The site's contribution to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt is minimal. Therefore, the removal of the site from the Green Belt and its allocation for housing will not materially affect the efficacy of the Green Belt in this part of the district.The adjoining settlement has capacity for additional housing and the allocation of this site can usefully contribute to meeting the acknowledged housing requirements.Development of this site would constitute sustainable development with no significant adverse impact. The site is available as soon as required, is developable without any insurmountable physical constraints to development, and is deliverable in the short term.Further more detailed justification will be provided in due course.

Question Ref: H4

y

Question Ref: H4

Site reference:1202Reason:Whilst we agree that this site has potential for housing development, we also consider that it is one of the most suitable sites for housing development, and therefore should be identified as green.

Question Ref: H5

Site reference:1202Reason:It is considered that this site is one of the most suitable sites for housing development and should be identified as green. The site is well related to the existing urban area and is close to shops and services, community and leisure facilities, public transport, education and local health facilities. The site's contribution to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt is minimal. Therefore, the removal of the site from the Green Belt and its allocation for housing will not materially affect the efficacy of the Green Belt in this part of the district.The adjoining settlement has capacity for additional housing and the allocation of this site can usefully contribute to meeting the acknowledged housing requirements.Development of this site would constitute sustainable development with no significant adverse impact. The site is available as soon as required, is developable without any insurmountable physical constraints to development, and is deliverable in the short term.Further more detailed justification will be provided in due course.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H11

1202 Short

North Comments

Name: Tim Smith

Representor No: PRS05531 Representation ID: REP06179

Question Ref: H1

I am writing to object to the proposed development of Moseley wood Bottom.

The plans Taylor Wimpey have put forward are dreadful. The plans will create 200 more houses in a area without the schools to take any extra children. The local schools are already oversubscribed.

The road access to the site is simply inadequate. Moseley Wood Gardens etc will become a rat run. The rounds around the site were not designed to cope with the volume of traffic that will be generated. There will also be bottle necks at rush hour which will then feed into the already congested roads near Horsforth station.

The plans will also increase the risk of flooding on the railway line and lower down Moseley Wood Beck.

Taylor Wimpey are simply trying to cram as many houses into an unsuitable site to maximise their profits. They have given no thought to how it will affect the existing community are the congestion problems the new residents will have to endure.

North Comments

Name: Andy Smith

Representor No: PRS05573 **Representation ID:** REP06224

Question Ref: H7

I agree that this site is not suitable for any development.

North Comments

Name: Martin Smith

Representor No: PRS05672 **Representation ID:** REP06337

Question Ref: H7

I agree fully with Leeds City Council that the land at Outwood Lane Site 1310 must not be considered suitable for house building and must be left alone to be enjoyed by present and future generations

North Comments

Name: Joyce Smith

Representor No: PRS06203 **Representation ID:** REP07091

Question Ref: H1

The plan for single access via Moseley Wood Bank is simply ridiculous. How a qualified surveyor can think otherwise defies belief.

200 homes - average 1.5 cars per house. 2 journeys = 600 cars on a road that can barely support the current traffic.

Is a new school planned? Otherwise where are the 200+ pupils going?

Concreting grassland increase flooding - known fact.

See also Representation form submitted

North Comments

Name: Ian Smith

Representor No: PRS06235 **Representation ID:** REP07352

Question Ref: H1

Former Office of the West Yorkshire Archives Service (to the east of this site) is a Grade II Listed Building. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, any development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.

Question Ref: H1

This site lies within the Headingley Conservation Area. The NPPF makes it clear that the loss of a building which makes a positive contribution to the significance of a Conservation Area should be regarded as resulting in substantial harm to that area. Consequently, if the buildings on the site make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, they should be retained.

Question Ref: H1

This site lies within the Headingley Conservation Area and includes the former Leeds High School for Girls which is a Grade II Listed Building. In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its Conservation Areas, there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this plot of land and the buildings on it make to the character of the Conservation Area. The NPPF makes it clear that the loss of a building which makes a positive contribution to the significance of a Conservation Area should be regarded as resulting in substantial harm to that area. Consequently, if the buildings on the site make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, they should be retained. If the open area at the southern end of this site makes an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, then that too should be retained. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, any development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.

Question Ref: H1

There are three Grade II Listed Buildings to the east and south of this area (The Grange, its Coach House and Service Range and the Cricketer's Arms). There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, redevelopment proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets are not harmed.

Question Ref: H4

The Lanier Business Centre to the south-west of this site is a Grade II Listed Building. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, redevelopment proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.

Question Ref: H4

The former York Road Library and Baths at the northern end of this site are Grade II Listed. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, any development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.

Question Ref: H4

The northern part of this site lies opposite the Beckett Street Cemetery a Grade II Registered Park and Garden. If allocated, any development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.

Question Ref: H7

Oddy's locks (at the southwestern corner of this site) and Castleton Mill (to the south) are Grade II Listed Buildings. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, any development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets are not harmed.

North Comments

Name: Ian Smith

Representor No: PRS06235 **Representation ID:** REP07369

Question Ref: H1

This site lies within the Newlay Conservation Area. The NPPF makes it clear that the loss of a building which makes a positive contribution to the significance of a Conservation Area should be regarded as resulting in substantial harm to that area. Consequently, if the buildings on the site make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, they should be retained. If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the character of this part of the Conservation Area are not harmed.

Question Ref: H1

There is a mural relief by Hubert Dalwood on Boddingtons Hall. This is Listed Grade II. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.

Question Ref: H1

This site lies within the Far Headingley Conservation Area. The NPPF makes it clear that the loss of a building which makes a positive contribution to the significance of a Conservation Area should be regarded as resulting in substantial harm to that area. Consequently, if the buildings on the site make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, they should be retained. If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the character of this part of the Conservation Area are not harmed.

Question Ref: H1

The Church of the Holy Trinity is a Grade II Listed Building. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, before allocating this area, there would need to be some assessment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the significance of this building and what effect its loss and subsequent development might have upon the significance of this asset. If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets (including their setting) are not likely to be harmed.

Question Ref: H4

Sandford Road School is a Grade II Listed Building. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, redevelopment proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.

Question Ref: H4

This site lies within the Roundhay Conservation Area. When originally designated, it is presumed that this open area was considered to make an important contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Therefore, one might assume that its loss and subsequent development would result in harm to that part of the designated area. In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its Conservation Areas, there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this plot of land makes to the character of the Conservation Area. If this area does make an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, then the plan would need to explain why its loss and subsequent development is considered to be acceptable.

Question Ref: H4

This site lies within the Newlay Conservation Area. When originally designated, it is presumed that this open area was considered to make an important contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Therefore, one might assume that its loss and subsequent development would result in harm to that part of the designated area. In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its Conservation Areas, there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this plot of land makes to the character of the Conservation Area. If this area does make an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, then the plan would need to explain why its loss and subsequent development is considered to be acceptable.

Question Ref: H4

This site lies within the Headingley Conservation Area. In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its Conservation Areas, there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the character of this part of the Conservation Area. If this area does make an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, then the plan would need to explain why its loss and subsequent development is considered to be acceptable.

Question Ref: H4

This site adjoins the boundary of the Meanwood Conservation Area. In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its Conservation Areas including their setting, there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this area makes to the landscape setting of the Conservation Area. If this area does make an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, then the plan would need to explain why its loss and subsequent development is considered to be acceptable. If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the character of that part of the adjacent Conservation Area are not harmed.

Question Ref: H4

This site adjoins the boundary of the Chapel Allerton Conservation Area in Bradford District. If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the character of that part of the adjacent Conservation Area are not harmed.

North Comments

Name: Ian Smith

Representor No: PRS06235 **Representation ID:** REP07369

Question Ref: H4

There are a number of Grade II Listed Buildings at around Carr Manor House. There is a requirement in the should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, before allocating this area, there would need to be some assesment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the significance of these buildings and what effect its loss and subsequent development might have upon the significance of these assets. If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets (including their setting) are not likely to be harmed.

Question Ref: H4

The bridge over Moseley Beck is a Grade II Listed Building. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, redevelopment proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.

Question Ref: General comment

There is a group of three Grade II Listed Buildings around Low Hall Farm on the northern side of Low Hall Road. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets (including their setting) are not likely to be harmed.

North Comments

Name: Ian Smith

Representor No: PRS06235 **Representation ID:** REP07391

Question Ref: E1

Part of this site lies within the Newlay Conservation Area. When originally designated, it is presumed that this open area was considered to make an important contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Therefore, one might assume that its loss and subsequent development would result in harm to that part of the designated area. The eastern edge adjoins the boundary of the Kirkstall Abbey Conservation Area. In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its Conservation Areas including their setting, there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the character and landscape setting of these Conservation Areas. If any parts of this area do make an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Areas, then the plan would need to explain why its loss and subsequent development is considered to be acceptable. This site also includes a number of Grade II Listed Buildings associated with Kirkstall Forge (the Forge Buildings with helve hammers, slitting mill machinery, the Stables and the former Cottages). There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, before allocating this area, there would need to be some assessment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the significance of these assets and what effect its loss and subsequent development might have upon their significance. If allocated, any development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets are not harmed. Because of the likelihood of archaeological remains in this area, any proposals for the development of this area should be required to provide an assessment of the impact which their proposals might have upon the significance of any archaeological remains together with an appropriate mitigation strategy

North Comments

Name: Catherine Snape

Representor No: PRS05742 Representation ID: REP06412

Question Ref: H4

To whom it may concern,

I would like express my opposition to the potential new housing on site 1202 off Victoria Avenue in Horsforth.

I am a local resident and believe that the site is unsuitable for housing.

I understand that the council believe that the site is suitable for 185 houses, however I believe that this would lead to over development of the area. 185 properties is a substantial amount for the plot in question and I do not believe there is sufficient space for this many properties on the site. This will lead to insufficient space to park and a lack of private space for the properties (both new and old) in the area.

It will also greatly increase traffic in the area and the road system will be unable to cope. The A65 is already a very busy road and is only a single carriageway, and will struggle to withstand a large increase in traffic caused by a large increase in housing in the area.

There is likely to be a poor relationship with adjoining buildings. All of the other others houses in the area are long -established and a new housing development would be contradictory to the character of the area.

This also represents a loss of open space. The fields are a large open space that is very desirable for residents in a large city and would be a great loss to local residents.

North Comments

Name: Peter Snodgrass

Representor No: PRS01001 **Representation ID:** REP03051

Question Ref: H7

3044, 3360, 1079, 2052, 1178B, 1243, 1246 - I support the fact that the site should remain as red and the reasons are:

- I agree with the current designation i.e. they are designated Green Belt
- There being no provision for further development due to lack of infrastructure etc.

North Comments

Name: Peter Snodgrass

Representor No: PRS01001 Representation ID: REP03054

Question Ref: H1

1033 - I object to this site being used for housing development for the following reasons:

- Inadequate road infrastructure to exit to cope with increased car ownership
- Impact on access to inadequate primary and secondary school places.

1178A - I object to this site being used for housing development for the following reasons:

- Impact on access to inadequate primary and secondary school places
- The population of Leeds is not increasing at th projected rate
- There are significant peak hour traffic problems already which fail to be addressed
- Loss of agricultural land to reduce future food imports
- There is limited public transport to the area

North Comments

Name: Peter Snodgrass

Representor No: PRS01001 Representation ID: REP05622

Question Ref: H1

1178A Land south of Dunstarn Le, Adel - Green

I object to this site being used for housing development for the following reasons:

- Impact on access to inadequate primary and secondary school places
- The population of Leeds is not increasing at th projected rate
- There are significant peak hour traffic problems already which fail to be addressed
- Loss of agricultural land to reduce future food imports
- There is limited public transport to the area

Question Ref: H1

1033 Government Buildings, Otley Rd - Green

I object to this site being used for housing development for the following reasons:

- Inadequate road infrastructure to exit to cope with increased car ownership
- Impact on access to inadequate primary and secondary school places.

North Comments

Name: Linda Solanki

Representor No: PRS01167 **Representation ID:** REP03262

Question Ref: H4

1016 - I wish to register my views that the land at both these sites is wholly unsuitable for housing development. The current traffic at this roundabout is very bad and access for these house onto the main road would make it even worse and yet more dangerous.
Therefore i wish to be quite clear:-

I agree with the classification of 1014 as not considered suitable for housing development and disagree that 1016 has potential for allocation of housing.

Question Ref: H7

1014 - I wish to register my views that the land at both these sites is wholly unsuitable for housing development. The current traffic at this roundabout is very bad and access for these house onto the main road would make it even worse and yet more dangerous.
Therefore i wish to be quite clear:-

I agree with the classification of 1014 as not considered suitable for housing development and disagree that 1016 has potential for allocation of housing.

North Comments

Name: Denise Solari

Representor No: PRS01592 Representation ID: REP00162

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

I believe that there are areas in the east/north east of Leeds which represent more suitable locations as there is more space to provide/create the amenities required and a more substantial road infrastructure to support and accommodate a large housing development.

Question Ref: H2

1199 Moseley Wood Gardens I object to any housing development on this site for the following reasons 1) the local amenities e.g. primary and high schools and GP surgeries are already under pressure to serve the demand from the existing residents in the area. 200(+) new houses would create a demand that was unsustainable for the existing amenities. 2) The road infrastructure both local and main routes in their current form would be under increased pressure to accommodate the rise in traffic accompanying such a development. (200 houses = approximately 200 x 2 additional vehicles) This is both harmful to the environment and results in further congestion on these routes particularly at commuting times. In addition the local roads around the existing primary school would become even more congested with parked cars at school drop off and pick up times increasing the risk of accidents- something which is already an issue. 3) Cookridge would lose a considerable amount of green space for the area- a reason why people choose to live in this area. Further housing in the area decreases the environmental/health benefits that green spaces provide.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

North Comments

Name: Denise Solari

Representor No: PRS01592 **Representation ID:** REP03742

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly Agree. The existing amenities will not support anymore residents e.g schools, doctors surgeries etc. Please consider putting all proposed applications in one area of Leeds and build the necessary amenities and facilities to support these additional residents. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree The width of the roads and increased parking will result in more accidents - pedestrian and car. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly Agree Schools in the area are already oversubscribed. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Strongly Agree Increased 'hard standing' = more flooding risk. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly Agree.

North Comments

Name: Shaun Solari

Representor No: PRS04769 Representation ID: REP01588

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Brownfield sites and empty properties should be prioritised

Question Ref: H2

1199 - Moseley Wood BottomInappropriate site - all local schools are already over subscribed as are health services. All traffic to and from the site are through an existing estate with narrow roads. Site is on a flood plain with poor drainage. Site is presently home for a lot of wildlife.

Question Ref: H3

1199 - Moseley Wood BottomInappropriate site - all local schools are already over subscribed as are health services. All traffic to and from the site are through an existing estate with narrow roads. Site is on a flood plain with poor drainage. Site is presently home for a lot of wildlife.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

1199 - Moseley Wood BottomInappropriate site - all local schools are already over subscribed as are health services. All traffic to and from the site are through an existing estate with narrow roads. Site is on a flood plain with poor drainage. Site is presently home for a lot of wildlife.

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H12

No

North Comments

Name: John Sowerbutts

Representor No: PRS05720 Representation ID: REP06388

Question Ref: H1

I strongly disagree with the decision to code site 1199 (Moseley Wood Gardens) as green and suitable for development.

There are many reasons why this decision is wrong:-

Primary Schools are already over subscribed

Access to medical services is already poor.

Potential flooding/drainage issues.

Urban spread.

Inadequate access to the site.

Highways issues.

These are just a small selection of reasons why the land should not be developed and should be re classified under the red category as unsuitable for development.

sites ref no's 1151 Cooridge Lane - 3044 Cookridge Hall Golf Club - 3360 Cookridge Hall

I agree with the red coding for all these sites my reasons are the same as detailed above.

There are many empty properties in Leeds that should be utilised first and brown fields sites should be developed first before any greenfields sites are utilised. I would also strongly question the growth figures for Leeds over the next 2 decades. These are well out of line with the current growth levels and give the impression that this is a dream created rather than a decision based on solid research and realistic expectation.

Question Ref: H7

sites ref no's 1151 Cooridge Lane - 3044 Cookridge Hall Golf Club - 3360 Cookridge Hall

I agree with the red coding for all these sites my reasons are the same as detailed above.

There are many empty properties in Leeds that should be utilised first and brown fields sites should be developed first before any greenfields sites are utilised. I would also strongly question the growth figures for Leeds over the next 2 decades. These are well out of line with the current growth levels and give the impression that this is a dream created rather than a decision based on solid research and realistic expectation.

North Comments

Name: K Sowerby

Representor No: PRS01848 **Representation ID:** REP04019

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. Lived at the above address since June, 1956 and was supposed to be left greenbelt from the property downwards!!!! Now they are wanting to build even more!!! The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Do not want this!!! Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. Bad enough trying to get an appointment now!!! The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Where is the water going to go??? Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. It would be a crying shame to disturb this!!

North Comments

Name: Patricia Spencer

Representor No: PRS01486 Representation ID: REP03623

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments- Strongly agree. Area would be overpopulated.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem- Strongly agree. No direct rout to estate so traffic would filter into streets. Bridge on railway station would become more congested.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly Agree. Schools too small now.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this- Strongly agree. Water drains from tunnel – natural springs

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree. Many wild birds e.g. Kingfishers and Heron will leave area.

North Comments

Name: Cheryl Spencer

Representor No: PRS01805 **Representation ID:** REP03974

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Malcolm Spencer

Representor No: PRS01807 **Representation ID:** REP03978

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Maureen Spencer

Representor No: PRS01849 Representation ID: REP04020

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. We only need affordable homes for the young people of Cookridge, first time buyers especially. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Agree. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Agree.

North Comments

Name: John Spencer

Representor No: PRS01851 **Representation ID:** REP04022

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. Leeds needs affordable housing, not property which will sell at a premium as property in Cookridge does. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Making Cookridge Drive a through access to a new development would require traffic calming measures to be introduced as it is a lone straight road. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. Waiting times to see some doctors in the area can be up to 14 days. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Having lived in Cookridge for over 50 years Moseley Beck has flooded on a very regular basis. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. All wet areas encourage a wide variety of wild life and Moseley Bottom is no exception.

North Comments

Name: Richard Spencer

Representor No: PRS02557 Representation ID: REP04848

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Richard Spencer

Representor No: PRS02557 Representation ID: REP04848

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Richard Spencer

Representor No: PRS02557 **Representation ID:** REP04848

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Richard Spencer

Representor No: PRS02557 Representation ID: REP04848

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Richard Spencer

Representor No: PRS02557 Representation ID: REP04848

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Richard Spencer

Representor No: PRS02557 **Representation ID:** REP04848

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Spencer

Representor No: PRS02646 **Representation ID:** REP05091

Question Ref: H1

- 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Spencer

Representor No: PRS02646 Representation ID: REP05091

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Spencer

Representor No: PRS02646 Representation ID: REP05091

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Spencer

Representor No: PRS02646 **Representation ID:** REP05091

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Spencer

Representor No: PRS02646 Representation ID: REP05091

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Spencer

Representor No: PRS02646 Representation ID: REP05091

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: Spencer

Representor No: PRS02646 **Representation ID:** REP05091

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: David Spencer

Representor No: PRS03805 **Representation ID:** REP01054

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H2

1095A - Pool. This site near the river is clearly unsuitable. The river floods here 4 or 5 times a year. Any flood defences would then push the water to properties down stream.1095A is at an extremely busy junction where traffic gets backed up and also where there are regular accidents (some fatal).1095B,- this IS green belt! and 1369. Pool is already at saturation point.There is significant commuter congestion, with very few options for public transport. Main Street Pool is increasingly unsafe. There are also already significant congestion issues for tourist traffic i.e. going to the Dales on a Friday/ Returning on a Sunday. Pool primary school is full and oversubscribed.There is a lack of services/facilities such as doctor's surgery.The areas suggested are inhabited by deer,otter,badgers,red kite,foxes, little owl, tawney owl and barn owl amongst many other species. There would be major outcry at the loss of habitat.Much of the flooding that occurs in Pool happens due to lack of soak away as the water comes down from the Chevin, if the remaining soak away area is removed then this will only exacerbate the situation.

Question Ref: H4

y

Question Ref: H4

Alwoodly 2053B - good transport links, not isolated from nearby housing

Question Ref: H6

2054 Alwoodly gates, has large capacity, good road and potentially public transport network, not isolated from nearby housing - local service infrastructure....

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

1095A - Pool. This site near the river is clearly unsuitable. The river floods here 4 or 5 times a year. Any flood defences would then push the water to properties down stream.1095A is at an extremely busy junction where traffic gets backed up and also where there are regular accidents (some fatal).

North Comments

Name: Phil Spencer

Representor No: PRS05676 Representation ID: REP06341

Question Ref: H7

I am writing to you to confirm my support of the Council's decision to declare the above site as not suitable for the allocation of housing in the Leeds Core Strategy.

I live at 5 Brodwell Grange LS18 4AU and am a very frequent user of Outwood Lane as both a pedestrian and a driver.

The only access from the public highway to this land is from the narrowest section of this road.

Traffic already come very close to each other and site lines are very poor. To introduce a new highway junction here would be madness as it would significantly increase the risk of accidents and injuries. Furthermore the creation of additional houses would in itself generate addition traffic volumes.

North Comments

Name: Linda Squire

Representor No: PRS05706 **Representation ID:** REP06372

Question Ref: H4

1202: Land off Victoria Avenue Horsforth

This cannot go ahead. I have lived here 22 years and have year after year seen more cars cutting through, more cars parking on street for college therefore more double yellow lines.

Children are able to walk unaided to Newlaithes but with more cars this will become increasingly dangerous, children enjoy making dens and playing in the fields. It will effect lovely views and blackberry picking, dog walking and horse riding and a lovely community atmosphere that all local residents have.

Newlaithes school has already been extended and is full, appointments at doctors are always strained. The roads are too narrow to fit anymore traffic. Already every Thursday the school bus for swimming has to beep cars from the road as it cannot get down, so often the children have to walk to the bus.

You are saturating Horsforth and the surrounding areas. Horsforth High are massively oversubscribed every year, and our great community is getting squeezed from every angle and it cannot take any more - please leave it alone....

North Comments

Name: Edith Standeaven

Representor No: PRS00997 Representation ID: REP03046

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

Overcrowded now.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

Cause more pollution

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

Longer waiting to see GP.

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

Would frighten lots of wildlife away from area.

North Comments

Name: Elsie Standerline

Representor No: PRS01704 **Representation ID:** REP03856

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. Roads unsuitable for heavy traffic. A regular bus service refused because of the roads being too narrow. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. The extra traffic caused by building is beyond belief, noise not tolerable. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. In 2005 I had to attend the LGI for treatment. I was not aware of any dentists in this area. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Flooding in summer already suffer on bottom of Green lane, hill crest and also snow thawing in winter. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. I have been at this address since May 1961. Wild birds and animals around, soon will disappear for good. God's creatures are there for a purpose.

RE Moseley Wood Bottom, quite a lot of trouble with children wandering to the attraction of water. Some years ago one little girl, troubled by exams took her own life.

North Comments

Name: Gillian Staneley

Representor No: PRS02462 **Representation ID:** REP04727

Question Ref: H7

I wish to endorse the decision made by Leeds City Council in respect of site 1015 Hunger Hills Viz "Not considered suitable for allocation of housing." Having lived at this address for over 30 years I have witnessed a vast increase in traffic using West End Lane/Rise with attendant road safety issues from traffic using this route to access the A65 and Ring Road- even to the extreme of large commercial vehicles who have difficulty negotiating the bends near Lee Lane West. Any increase brought about by access to a new housing development would be madness, creating hazardous and dangerous conditions particularly for local children walking to the nearby Primary/Junior school. An increase in pupil numbers caused by any future development would be untenable in an area already struggling to supply places for the current demand. The area already faces increased vehicular traffic due to the demands of the nearby Leeds Trinity University. A further loss of green space and leisure amenities created by this historic wooded area would impact on residents and walkers who visit the area. Leeds City Council should be congratulated on their eminently sensible decision on the evidence presented that this area is "not considered suitable for allocation of housing"

North Comments

Name: Bradley Stankler

Representor No: PRS03187 Representation ID: REP05943

Question Ref: H4

I write in response to Leeds City Council's proposition to site 185 houses off Victoria Ave, Horsforth.

As a [x] would

like to state our strong opposition to this.

We bought our house solely for the area, being one of the last quieter areas in Leeds where we can raise a family. We paid a high premium for this in the property value and any change in the neighbourhood could strongly affect our housing investment.

The potential housing development is a short term plan and the long term issues have not been considered. The road infrastructure around the area can simply not cope with any additional pressure. The local roads where children can currently be seen playing will be inundated with cars making it a dangerous noisy road.

This is in addition to a loss of a valuable green space where many dog walkers, winter sledgers as well as children playing currently enjoy.

I do not believe any further infrastructure needs such as doctors, schools or sewerage improvements have also been considered.

I beg Leeds council not to destroy one of the last mature community suburbs of Leeds and make it the same mass sprawl identikit areas that much of Leeds has turned into.

North Comments

Name: Anne Stanway

Representor No: PRS00830 **Representation ID:** REP02845

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

Enough housing already.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

The MW Drive is a rat run already as well as school parking - no more!

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

Can't get in to see doctors for over a week now.

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: J.t Stanway

Representor No: PRS00937 Representation ID: REP02973

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

The area is crowded enough.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

We have enough traffic from the school already.

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

Enough cars come from outside the area.

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Terry Steel

Representor No: PRS01226 **Representation ID:** REP03329

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. The road system can't cope with the existing traffic in bad weather.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree.

The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree. It's madness to think about building on land that does flood.

Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Jackie Steel

Representor No: PRS01229 Representation ID: REP03331

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. The roads are blocked every time it snows now so with more cars it will be worse.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. All the local schools are full now.

The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree. Our gardens flood now so with new houses it will be worse.

Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Sophie Stenton

Representor No: PRS01569 **Representation ID:** REP03715

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Unsure. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Agree. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Unsure. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Unsure. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly Agree.

North Comments

Name: Clare Stephenson

Representor No: PRS04675 **Representation ID:** REP01894

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

I would like to raise an objection to the redevelopment of site 118

Question Ref: H2

With regard to site 118 I would like to raise an objection to the redevelopment of the site for the following reasons. Firstly round the corner on the Drive there is undeveloped land with two part-built properties which are unfinished with no evidence that they will be completed. They are an eye saw for the people living opposite. It would seem reasonable to expect that these properties are finished and made habitable before alternative sites are identified. Secondly access to site 118 is already relatively limited from teh View which is often congested with parked cars. Thirdly, the impact of a development of more houses/ flats on site 118 would lead to reduce privacy and increased noise for the properties on the west side of Edgbaston Walk. With many thanks for taking this opinion into consideration when making planning decisions. [x]

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

North Comments

Name: Stirling Investment Properties Llp

Representor No: PRS06433 Representation ID: REP07503

Question Ref: Unspecified

The process of designing and justifying the development of land at Cookridge Hall has been informed by a significant degree of research and technical input.

2.44. The process has focused on highways; ecology; masterplanning and visual impact.

2.45. The process has had due regard to planning policy and planning history; previous representations; housing need in North Leeds; and site specific characteristics.

See the pdf for detailed comments.

North Comments

Name: Susan Stockley

Representor No: PRS03132 Representation ID: REP00687

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I am particularly concerned that the areas marked orange and red are not developed - Old Lane, Moor Road, King Lane and the Sycamores. If housing has to be built then I would favour the green area as it is not open country side. It would be particularly upsetting if houses were built around Bramhope Cemetry which our family our buried in and chosen for its connections and peace and tranquility and beauty. The areas around Old Lane, Moor Road, King Lane and the Sycamores are lovely countryside which should be protected. It would be a massive shame if they were spoilt. The green area is the least bad alternative although we would rather no houses are built there at all.

Question Ref: H3

No - I don't think any other sites in Bramhope should be green.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Definitely not - these are massive areas - housing which would significantly increase Bramhope's size. Beautiful countryside would be ruined. Bramhope would become more of a commuter town than a village. it would be a scandal to build houses there.

Question Ref: H5

1080, 3367A, 1002, 3400

Question Ref: H6

No

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

1204 Old Lane - is a beautiful setting overlooking the Wharfe Valley. It is a tranquil spot near the cricket ground and a quiet narrow lane. It would be completely unsuitable for more housing. It is virtually impossible to read the numbers on the map but I think it is 3434 Moor Lane. Open countryside would be ruined. Bramhope would end up being a conurbation. My sister and father are buried in the (v expensive) cemetery - this should remain a quiet spot for remembrance not overlooked by houses and lots of traffic. I can't read the other red numbers clearly in Bramhope (118114 etc) but I think none of them should be used as housing. They are all lovely countryside and the extent would change the nature of Bramhope.

Question Ref: H10

No. I think if housing is needed use brown field sites only and build flats. Surely we want to protect the countryside for future generations.

Question Ref: H11

1199 would be the least bad alternative for short/medium term housing. 364 may be a longer term alternative but I would not advocate any housing in Bramhope personally.

Question Ref: H13

No

Question Ref: H14

possibly 1199

Question Ref: H15

no

Question Ref: General comment

Please please do not build down Moor Road and Old Lane and King Lane and the Sycamores in Bramhope.

North Comments

Name: Margret Stocks

Representor No: PRS01469 **Representation ID:** REP03602

Question Ref: H4

Sorry I have not been able to reply earlier to this letter, and, although I am aware that the 'deadline' date of 29th July 2013 has passed, I would like to give my opinion on this proposed building.

My first question is: You state that there is a capacity for 185 properties. Would the Planning Department be wishing to build to this absolute capacity, and do the Planning Department think this would be feasible to build to the absolute capacity of 185?

My second question is: You state in your literature that the proposed site has issues. I would be interested to know what kind of issues these are. My own issues about this site are as follows:

I cannot see how these extra houses would have any easy exits to be able to access New Road Side and the immediate areas around, already a busy area for car drivers, particularly bearing in mind all other possible future sites, including some green sites (as seen on the plan recently sent out to Horsforth residents) which could be earmarked for future building in this area. These 185 houses could, and probably would, bring an estimate of an equal number of cars — this is already becoming a big problem in this area. New Road Side is part of one of the main arteries coming out of Leeds City Centre on its way up to Otley and beyond and is well used. As traffic reaches the roundabout coming up to the Ring Road there can be a backlog of cars, from both the Ring Road and the roads coming over the roundabout accessing all areas around. There are future plans for the other side of the Ring Road past Horsforth which alone will create more cars on this roundabout, as there is no other way to get across the Ring Road to continue one's journey.

Beyond this roundabout (about five yards over it) on the way to Guiseley and Otley) there is a right-hand turn which cars use to access their street. I myself have seen three accidents here because of this immediate right-hand turn, which unsuspecting car drivers going across and turning left from Rodley are not prepared for. Only one accident or hold up here creates can bring traffic to a standstill

EXITING FOR THE PROPOSED NEW PROPERTY OWNERS:
Possible exits which may be used by the occupants of these proposed houses:

As a car driver I am in a good position to know the problems of the roads leading up to that part of New Road Side.

Exit 1 which may be used by the new property owners:
(Already car drivers from the Victorias use this, as they are very near to this exit).

Where the proposed 1202 site in the Victorias, I can see a very big problem when these cars wish to exit onto New Road Side or to turn right to go down to Leeds City Centre, as all these streets already have cars parked on either side of the road, which will inevitably force these car drivers to look for other means of exiting. Even if there will be an exit made somewhere on this site, there is bound to be a backlog of drivers trying to get onto New Road Side, along with existing car drivers who already live in this area.

Although living only a matter of yards from New Road Side it is not always easy to exit onto the main road because of the volume of cars both exiting and coming into Newlaithes, and cars constantly backing in and out from the Tesco Store on the corner which, although this is an important shop for community food supplies, etc.. generates a lot of traffic, often parking on the parking spaces on New Road Side are full. Coupled with this is the fact that there is an inside Play Centre whose access for car drivers is around the back of Tesco's and where cars come into. Also, three houses have recently been built adjacent to Tesco's but about five yards lower down on the other side of the road (two semi-detached and one detached at the back of these) generating more car parking at this busy spot.. Also heavy lorries have to park wherever they can to offload supplies to Tesco's.

Any new traffic trying to find an alternative exit from the Victorias (cars already use this exit from these streets) to access turning right for the City Centre) would make a difficult situation here even worse.

Possible Exit 2:
Running parallel with the 'Tesco's' exit, is

I myself try to use this exit to avoid the 'Tesco' exit when it is difficult to access New Road Side from this way owing to offloading lorries and cars coming in and out. Near the main road is another unmade road which is used at the top end by a comparatively new Housing estate a little further down the main road, in order for them to turn onto New Road Side (turning right or left), or turn immediate left down this parallel road. This exit is also used by another Housing estate at the bottom of this road. This road could be very busy if car drivers from the 1202 site decided to use this road (as some of them will).

Going back to the potential building in Horsforth, new houses cannot be built unless they have the attendant facilities for the people in them, such as schools, doctors, and essential social and leisure facilities, such as places to walk, and playing fields for the young people of the area to be able to partake in these social activities. I understand from the previous plans that one of the Horsforth playing fields has been possibly earmarked for building! Already the green areas of Horsforth are dwindling — thank goodness at least we have Horsforth Park and the adjacent woods. Although there seems to be yet more plans to build around them!

I would hate to see this area develop into another bottleneck like Headingley, and ask the question how many more houses are planned in this area without the facilities to build amenities.

My question is how much land has been put into the equation for schools, etc. I am worried as to the closing of local Police Stations. The Government's policy on cutting down on services such as the local Police, etc. is worrying with the advent of more and more housing needed. I doubt whether in this overcrowded country the Government will ever keep up to a burgeoning population.

North Comments

Name: Margret Stocks

Representor No: PRS01469 Representation ID: REP04252

Question Ref: H4

1202 -
LAND OFF VICTORIA AVENUE, HORSFORTH

Sorry I have not been able to reply earlier to this letter, and, although I am aware that the 'deadline' date of 29th July 2013 has passed, I would like to give my opinion on this proposed building.[Sent in before deadline - but has since added street names]

My first question is: You state that there is a capacity for 185 properties. Would the Planning Department be wishing to build to this absolute capacity, and do the Planning Department think this would be feasible to build to the absolute capacity of 185?

My second question is: You state in your literature that the proposed site has issues. I would be interested to know what kind of issues these are. My own issues about this site are as follows:

I cannot see how these extra houses would have any easy exits to be able to access New Road Side and the immediate areas around, already a busy area for car drivers, particularly bearing in mind all other possible future sites, including some green sites (as seen on the plan recently sent out to Horsforth residents) which could be earmarked for future building in this area. These 185 houses could, and probably would, bring an estimate of an equal number of cars — this is already becoming a big problem in this area. New Road Side is part of one of the main arteries coming out of Leeds City Centre on its way up to Otley and beyond and is well used. As traffic reaches the roundabout coming up to the Ring Road there can be a backlog of cars, from both the Ring Road and the roads coming over the roundabout accessing all areas around. There are future plans for the other side of the Ring Road past Horsforth which alone will create more cars on this roundabout, as there is no other way to get across the Ring Road to continue one's journey.

Beyond this roundabout (about five yards over it) on the way to Guiseley and Otley) there is a right-hand turn which cars use to access their street. I myself have seen three accidents here because of this immediate right-hand turn, which unsuspecting car drives going across and turning left from Rodley are not prepared for.

Only one accident or hold up here creates can bring traffic to a standstill
EXITING FOR THE PROPOSED NEW PROPERTY OWNERS:

Possible exits which may be used by the occupants of these proposed houses:

As a car driver I am in a good position to know the problems of the roads leading up to that part of New Road Side.

Exit 1 which may be used by the new property owners: Clarence Drive / Newlaithes Gardens (Already car drivers from the Victorias use this, as they are very near to this exit).

Where the proposed 1202 site in the Victorias, I can see a very big problem when these cars wish to exit onto New Road Side or to turn right to go down to Leeds City Centre, as all these streets already have cars parked on either side of the road, which will inevitably force these car drivers to look for other means of exiting. Even if there will be an exit made somewhere on this site, there is bound to be a backlog of drivers trying to get onto New Road Side, along with existing car drivers who already live in this area.

Although living only a matter of yards from New Road Side it is not always easy to exit onto the main road because of the volume of cars both exiting and coming into Newlaithes Gardens, and cars constantly backing in and out from the Tesco Store on the corner which, although this is an important shop for community food supplies, etc., generates a lot of traffic, often parking on the parking spaces on New Road Side are full. Coupled with this is the fact that there is an inside Play Centre whose access for car drivers is around the back of Tesco's and where cars come into. Also, three houses have recently been built adjacent to Tesco's but about five yards lower down on the other side of the road (two semi-detached and one detached at the back of these) generating more car parking at this busy spot. Also heavy lorries have to park wherever they can to offload supplies to Tesco's.

Any new traffic trying to find an alternative exit from the Victorias (cars already use this exit from these streets) to access turning right for the City Centre) would make a difficult situation here even worse.

Possible Exit 2:

Running parallel with the 'Tesco's' exit, is Newlaithes Road.

I myself try to use this exit to avoid the 'Tesco' exit when it is difficult to access New Road Side from this way owing to offloading lorries and cars coming in and out.

Near the main road is another unmade road, Newley Lane, which is used at the top end by a comparatively new Housing estate a little further down the main road, in order for them to turn onto New Road Side (turning right or left), or turn immediate left down this parallel road. This exit is also used by another Housing estate at the bottom of this road. This road could be very busy if car drivers from the 1202 site decided to use this road (as some of them will).

Going back to the potential building in Hosforth, new houses cannot be built unless they have the attendant facilities for the people in them, such as schools, doctors, and essential social and leisure facilities, such as places to walk, and playing fields for the young people of the area to be able to partake in these social activities. I understand

North Comments

Name: Margret Stocks

Representor No: PRS01469 **Representation ID:** REP04252

from the previous plans that one of the Horsforth playing fields has been possibly earmarked for building! Already the green areas of Horsforth are dwindling — thank goodness at least we have Horsforth Park and the adjacent woods

Although there seems to be yet more plans to build around them!

I would hate to see this area develop into another bottleneck like Headingley, and ask the question how many more houses are planned in this area without the facilities to build amenities.

My question is how much land has been put into the equation for schools, etc. I am worried as to the closing of local Police Stations. The Government's policy on cutting down on services such as the local Police, etc. is worrying with the advent of more and more housing needed. I doubt whether in this overcrowded country the Government will ever keep up to a burgeoning population.

North Comments

Name: Debra Stocks

Representor No: PRS01509 Representation ID: REP03650

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Strongly agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Andrew Stodolny

Representor No: PRS01822 **Representation ID:** REP03989

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The risk of spoling the calm of the area. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Pretty obvious that 200 houses = 200+ cars on streets not designed for such traffic. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. If you convert a flood area that are less places for water to go into the ground. Surveyors know this perfectly well. Picked up when moved here, has to check to see if insurance was ok. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Agree

North Comments

Name: Christine Stodolny

Representor No: PRS02037 **Representation ID:** REP04238

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. The only way out of the new estate will be a small narrow road it will be impossible for 200 - 400 cars to use it at rush hour. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. I have just moved to the area and the flooding in that area was picked up on the survey. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Steven Stokoe

Representor No: PRS01247 Representation ID: REP03351

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree. A massive housing development like this will require further infrastructure elsewhere, causing more disruption

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Traffic jams already over Horsforth Bridge. It will not cope with extra traffic.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. Either the existing facilities will have to cope and this would mean a poorer service or new schools, etc (more building!)

The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Agree.

Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree. Extremely important to me> We need our fields and wildlife environment.

North Comments

Name: Michelle Storer

Representor No: PRS01613 **Representation ID:** REP03766

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments- Strongly agree. We do not have the infrastructure to support 200 houses and residents; school places, traffic, loss greenfield, train congestion inconvenience of construction. We strongly object to this new housing development.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem- Strongly agree.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly Agree.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this- Strongly agree.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: R K Storr

Representor No: PRS01292 **Representation ID:** REP03400

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree. The surrounding area cannot take any more traffic

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Just one car at each new house means 200 more cars

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. The schools cannot take any more children

The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Agree.

Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree. We do not have enough habitats anyway

North Comments

Name: David Strachan

Representor No: PRS05603 **Representation ID:** REP06260

Question Ref: H7

This email is to confirm that I agree with the following classification...

Site 1015; Hunger Hills and land south of Lee Lane West as NOT suitable for allocation of housing

North Comments

Name: Amanda Strachan

Representor No: PRS05896 Representation ID: REP06643

Question Ref: H7

Dear Sir / Madam

This email is to confirm that I agree with the following classification:

Site 1015: Hunger Hills and land south of Lee Lane West as NOT suitable for allocation of housing

The site is an area of natural beauty and an integral part of Horsforth's charm and character

The land is enjoyed by many local residents who use it for outdoor activities such as dog walking, jogging, rambling, horse riding

It is served by roads that are already subject to dangerous overcrowding

Kind regards

North Comments

Name: Viv Stringer

Representor No: PRS01673 **Representation ID:** REP03829

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Rat runs, lack of schools, land to be built on looks very likely to flood. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Rat Runs noice. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Schools full to already. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. As already stated over. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: M.j. Strother

Representor No: PRS01501 Representation ID: REP03640

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments- Strongly agree. There are more areas for them to build on. More expensive but the cost should be theirs, not that of wildlife and the community of Cookridge.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem- Strongly agree. Chaotic now, even more when building commences.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly Agree. The whole thing is wrong.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this- Strongly agree. Most definatley, ask residents who have been flooded in the past!

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree. Destroying wildlife can not be right.

North Comments

Name: O.m. Strother

Representor No: PRS01502 **Representation ID:** REP03641

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments- Strongly agree. This is luxury, not affordable housing and will be a drain on the community.
The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem- Strongly agree. Can't get out of my drive now at peak times and it takes an hour to 1.5 hrs to drive into Leeds which should be a 20min to half hour journey.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly Agree. Can't get a doctor's appointment now without great difficulty.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this- Strongly agree. Would love to know how the builders will make it a safe area. They could not answer that at the meeting.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree. How to wreck a beautiful area!!! The plans are wrong and always been

North Comments

Name: J.p. Strother

Representor No: PRS01503 Representation ID: REP03642

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments- Strongly agree. The infrastructure cannot possibly cope with more intrusion in this area.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem- Strongly agree. Its difficult now at peak times to leave my property – 5-10min.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly Agree. Have to wait 2-3 weeks now before able to obtain a doctors appointment.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this- Strongly agree. Its is known as 'soggy bottom' which speaks for itself. It is not suitable for building on.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree. It is one of the best wildlife areas for children of residents and dog walkers to enjoy.

North Comments

Name: John Stuart

Representor No: PRS05666 Representation ID: REP06331

Question Ref: H7

My wife Carol and I wish to inform you that we agree with the Council.

Site 1310 is not considered suitable for the allocation of housing. We wish our objection to any building developments on this land to be registered with the relevant Authority.

North Comments

Name: Lynne Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02584 **Representation ID:** REP04879

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Lynne Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02584 Representation ID: REP04879

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Lynne Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02584 Representation ID: REP04879

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Lynne Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02584 **Representation ID:** REP04879

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Lynne Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02584 Representation ID: REP04879

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Lynne Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02584 Representation ID: REP04879

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Lynne Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02584 **Representation ID:** REP04879

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Ingrid Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02617 Representation ID: REP04917

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Ingrid Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02617 Representation ID: REP04917

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Ingrid Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02617 **Representation ID:** REP04917

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Ingrid Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02617 Representation ID: REP04917

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Ingrid Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02617 Representation ID: REP04917

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Ingrid Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02617 **Representation ID:** REP04917

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: B C Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02620 **Representation ID:** REP04923

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: B C Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02620 Representation ID: REP04923

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: B C Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02620 Representation ID: REP04923

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: B C Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02620 **Representation ID:** REP04923

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: B C Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02620 Representation ID: REP04923

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: B C Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02620 Representation ID: REP04923

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: B C Stutterheim

Representor No: PRS02620 **Representation ID:** REP04923

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Kathleen Styrin

Representor No: PRS00859 **Representation ID:** REP02876

Question Ref: H1

1199 - No - See the next question for the main reasons.

Question Ref: H2

H2

1199 - Comments

- A housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic.
- We do not have the infrastructure to cope with the extra traffic.
- Moseley Wood Gardens has a concrete base. A cosmetic layer of tarmac is periodically applied. Extra traffic will have an impact. Streets will require constant attention. Heavy plant used during site construction will create further damage to the concrete base.
- Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times. That situation will worsen substantially with the new development.
- Commuters from Harrogate, Otley and outlying areas use Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route. Additional local traffic from a new estate will add to the problems.
- The development will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. Traffic from a new development will add substantially to the winter chaos. Roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Cookridge in winter months.
- The area will attract less people with the increased difficulties in navigating to and from Cookridge.
- The development will impact on the local schools. School places will become an issue.
- Parking is problematic and dangerous outside of the local school, Tesco and Post Office. Road safety is of prime concern. The problems will worsen with a new development. Residents are severely affected by the current situation.
- The train service is questionable. A minimum number of carriages are provided at peak times. Parking at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate for local people. Commuters travel by car from outside Leeds, park their cars on the streets around the station, and use the local train. Extra housing will compound the problems.
- There is concern over the inadequacy of the current public transport system in the area and there is poor connectivity to a number of locations in the city. As a result of this issue and a number of others this development would neither be environmentally or socially sustainable.
- Flooding may become a problem to the railway line from surface run off, causing delays.
- The countryside adjacent to Cookridge will be destroyed along with the ecology.

North Comments

Name: David Styryn

Representor No: PRS00860 **Representation ID:** REP02878

Question Ref: H1

1199 - No - See the next question for the main reasons.

Question Ref: H2

1199 - Comments

- A housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic.
- We do not have the infrastructure to cope with the extra traffic.
- Moseley Wood Gardens has a concrete base. A cosmetic layer of tarmac is periodically applied. Extra traffic will have an impact. Streets will require constant attention. Heavy plant used during site construction will create further damage to the concrete base.
- Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times. That situation will worsen substantially with the new development.
- Commuters from Harrogate, Otley and outlying areas use Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route. Additional local traffic from a new estate will add to the problems.
- The development will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. Traffic from a new development will add substantially to the winter chaos. Roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Cookridge in winter months.
- The area will attract less people with the increased difficulties in navigating to and from Cookridge.
- The development will impact on the local schools. School places will become an issue.
- Parking is problematic and dangerous outside of the local school, Tesco and Post Office. Road safety is of prime concern. The problems will worsen with a new development. Residents are severely affected by the current situation.
- The train service is questionable. A minimum number of carriages are provided at peak times. Parking at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate for local people. Commuters travel by car from outside Leeds, park their cars on the streets around the station, and use the local train. Extra housing will compound the problems.
- There is concern over the inadequacy of the current public transport system in the area and there is poor connectivity to a number of locations in the city. As a result of this issue and a number of others this development would neither be environmentally or socially sustainable.
- Flooding may become a problem to the railway line from surface run off, causing delays.
- The countryside adjacent to Cookridge will be destroyed along with the ecology.

North Comments

Name: David Stylin

Representor No: PRS00860 **Representation ID:** REP04549

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom Green to Red. Strongly agree Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Unsure the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

North Comments

Name: Rebecca Stylin

Representor No: PRS00861 Representation ID: REP02879

Question Ref: H1

1199 - No - See the next question for the main reasons.

Question Ref: H2

1199 - Comments

- A housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic.
- We do not have the infrastructure to cope with the extra traffic.
- Moseley Wood Gardens has a concrete base. A cosmetic layer of tarmac is periodically applied. Extra traffic will have an impact. Streets will require constant attention. Heavy plant used during site construction will create further damage to the concrete base.
- Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times. That situation will worsen substantially with the new development.
- Commuters from Harrogate, Otley and outlying areas use Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route. Additional local traffic from a new estate will add to the problems.
- The development will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. Traffic from a new development will add substantially to the winter chaos. Roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Cookridge in winter months.
- The area will attract less people with the increased difficulties in navigating to and from Cookridge.
- The development will impact on the local schools. School places will become an issue.
- Parking is problematic and dangerous outside of the local school, Tesco and Post Office. Road safety is of prime concern. The problems will worsen with a new development. Residents are severely affected by the current situation.
- The train service is questionable. A minimum number of carriages are provided at peak times. Parking at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate for local people. Commuters travel by car from outside Leeds, park their cars on the streets around the station, and use the local train. Extra housing will compound the problems.
- There is concern over the inadequacy of the current public transport system in the area and there is poor connectivity to a number of locations in the city. As a result of this issue and a number of others this development would neither be environmentally or socially sustainable.
- Flooding may become a problem to the railway line from surface run off, causing delays.
- The countryside adjacent to Cookridge will be destroyed along with the ecology.

North Comments

Name: Michael Styrin

Representor No: PRS00862 Representation ID: REP02880

Question Ref: H1

1199 - No - See the next question for the main reasons.

Question Ref: H2

1199 - Comments

- A housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic.
- We do not have the infrastructure to cope with the extra traffic.
- Moseley Wood Gardens has a concrete base. A cosmetic layer of tarmac is periodically applied. Extra traffic will have an impact. Streets will require constant attention. Heavy plant used during site construction will create further damage to the concrete base.
- Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times. That situation will worsen substantially with the new development.
- Commuters from Harrogate, Otley and outlying areas use Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route. Additional local traffic from a new estate will add to the problems.
- The development will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. Traffic from a new development will add substantially to the winter chaos. Roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Cookridge in winter months.
- The area will attract less people with the increased difficulties in navigating to and from Cookridge.
- The development will impact on the local schools. School places will become an issue.
- Parking is problematic and dangerous outside of the local school, Tesco and Post Office. Road safety is of prime concern. The problems will worsen with a new development. Residents are severely affected by the current situation.
- The train service is questionable. A minimum number of carriages are provided at peak times. Parking at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate for local people. Commuters travel by car from outside Leeds, park their cars on the streets around the station, and use the local train. Extra housing will compound the problems.
- There is concern over the inadequacy of the current public transport system in the area and there is poor connectivity to a number of locations in the city. As a result of this issue and a number of others this development would neither be environmentally or socially sustainable.
- Flooding may become a problem to the railway line from surface run off, causing delays.
- The countryside adjacent to Cookridge will be destroyed along with the ecology.

North Comments

Name: Karen Sudbury

Representor No: PRS05740 **Representation ID:** REP05952

Question Ref: H4

I am writing to express my views on the site allocation plan in relation to the proposal of building on 1202 land off Victoria Avenue, Horsforth.

As a local resident I am writing to express my objection to these proposals. My children attend the local school of Newlaithes Primary and the flow of traffic around this area is already a cause of concern for myself and other parents/residents. I have genuine concerns about the surrounding infrastructure not being able to cope if any building were to go ahead in that area. The congestion around the roundabout is already at full capacity with lengthy delays at peak times in the morning and evening commuting periods. I also have real concerns about the local community not being able to cope with such an increase in local residents in terms of primary and secondary school provision, not to mention pressure put on local services such as GP practices.

The land mentioned in the proposals is a much needed area of green land which is used by the local community - children play there, residents walk their dogs and it gives a welcome, much needed change from the largely built up surrounding area. I would worry that the increased flow of traffic which building on this area would produce would present a real risk to the children using the local school and add to the already high levels of congestion in the area.

I would therefore like to voice my objection to any proposal to build on the above mentioned land; I would like to stress that I believe the site is unsuitable for housing.

North Comments

Name: Karen Sudbury

Representor No: PRS05740 **Representation ID:** REP06410

Question Ref: H4

I am writing to express my views on the site allocation plan in relation to the proposal of building on 1202 land off Victoria Avenue, Horsforth. As a local resident I am writing to express my objection to these proposals. My children attend the local school of Newlaithes Primary and the flow of traffic around this area is already a cause of concern for myself and other parents/residents. I have genuine concerns about the surrounding infrastructure not being able to cope if any building were to go ahead in that area. The congestion around the roundabout is already at full capacity with lengthy delays at peak times in the morning and evening commuting periods. I also have real concerns about the local community not being able to cope with such an increase in local residents in terms of primary and secondary school provision, not to mention pressure put on local services such as GP practices.

The land mentioned in the proposals is a much needed area of green land which is used by the local community - children play there, residents walk their dogs and it gives a welcome, much needed change from the largely built up surrounding area. I would worry that the increased flow of traffic which building on this area would produce would present a real risk to the children using the local school and add to the already high levels of congestion in the area.

I would therefore like to voice my objection to any proposal to build on the above mentioned land; I would like to stress that I believe the site is unsuitable for housing.

North Comments

Name: Derick Sugden

Representor No: PRS00642 Representation ID: REP02629

Question Ref: G17

2055 When you realise the benefits of allotments to the people of Leeds.

a) Producing & eating fresh produce.

b) Keeping fit by the constant exercise.

C) The wonderful camaraderie that exists – money cannot buy this.

It would be a folly of great magnitude to use this land for building particularly when so many brown sites are crying out for development.

North Comments

Name: Peter Summers

Representor No: PRS00995 Representation ID: REP03044

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

Already concentration of housing.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

Restricted site access.

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Patricia Summers

Representor No: PRS01272 Representation ID: REP03378

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree. More green land gone forever.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Even with 2 access points this will not dilute the heavy traffic through Cookridge.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. All the local schools are full already

The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Agree. The development would create more surface run off. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree. Concerned about more trees being felled- loss of habitat.

North Comments

Name: Kim Surtees

Representor No: PRS01683 Representation ID: REP03822

Question Ref: H1

I would like to express my views on various sites in the North Leeds area which have recently been assessed for suitability for housing development under the Local Development Framework, currently open to public consultation.

I comment on a number of sites, but primarily my objection is to the development of sites 1178A and site 1178B, 1178A suggested to be allocated Green on the proposed plan. This site should not be classed as suitable for development for a number of valid reasons which I will explain, referring to the provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CV) and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF"). I am no doubt you will be aware that there is a huge public outcry at such unnecessary devastation of our vital Green Belt land, and this opinion is staunchly supported by Cllr Barry Anderson and Mr Greg Mulholland MP. I fully endorse Mr Mulholland's questioning as to the methodology which has been used to arrive at the amount of housing required in Leeds which seems astronomical. I would be interested to know your comments following the work of Dr Rachael Unsworth at the University of Leeds who suggests that the planning process should be based on future rejections rather than on historic patterns of demand. Instead we should be looking to develop new kinds of communities, which minimise the need to travel and are energy efficient, on brownfield sites in central locations.

It is interesting to note that site 1178a is one of only 13 out of 73 sites in the area to score 6 or below out of 15 points for the suitability of the local infrastructure. It is the only site with such a low score to be approved for development. The local road network, schooling facilities, shopping facilities, medical support and general amenities are hugely insufficient to cope with this massive increase in housing. The Adel area is already supporting Leeds growth with the developments of Boddington Hall, Church Lane, Governments Buildings and Eastmoor. Once this volume of houses is occupied, the area will already be beyond capacity without further developments over the next 15 years.

Page 1 of 7

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning PM-1c/para 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... The district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched" Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of *Britton v 101*; the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch
B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site 1178A objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yhorsire Bath Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear, defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

I. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(h) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Page 3 of 7

2. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network"

NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties"

Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network/ — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of

an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

3. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched" CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green

North Comments

Name: Kim Surtees

Representor No: PRS01683 **Representation ID:** REP03822

infrastructure plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites. • 2130 — CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "RED" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H4

• 2130 — CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "RED" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Kim Surtees

Representor No: PRS01683 Representation ID: REP03822

Question Ref: H7

I would like to express my views on various sites in the North Leeds area which have recently been assessed for suitability for housing development under the Local Development Framework, currently open to public consultation.

I comment on a number of sites, but primarily my objection is to the development of sites 1178A and site 1178B, 1178A suggested to be allocated Green on the proposed plan. This site should not be classed as suitable for development for a number of valid reasons which I will explain, referring to the provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CV) and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF"). I am no doubt you will be aware that there is a huge public outcry at such unnecessary devastation of our vital Green Belt land, and this opinion is staunchly supported by Cllr Barry Anderson and Mr Greg Mulholland MP. I fully endorse Mr Mulholland's questioning as to the methodology which has been used to arrive at the amount of housing required in Leeds which seems astronomical. I would be interested to know your comments following the work of Dr Rachael Unsworth at the University of Leeds who suggests that the planning process should be based on future rejections rather than on historic patterns of demand. Instead we should be looking to develop new kinds of communities, which minimise the need to travel and are energy efficient, on brownfield sites in central locations.

It is interesting to note that site 1178a is one of only 13 out of 73 sites in the area to score 6 or below out of 15 points for the suitability of the local infrastructure. It is the only site with such a low score to be approved for development. The local road network, schooling facilities, shopping facilities, medical support and general amenities are hugely insufficient to cope with this massive increase in housing. The Adel area is already supporting Leeds growth with the developments of Boddington Hall, Church Lane, Governments Buildings and Eastmoor. Once this volume of houses is occupied, the area will already be beyond capacity without further developments over the next 15 years.

Page 1 of 7

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning PM-1c/para 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... The district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched" Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of *Britton v 101*; the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch
B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site 1178A objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yhorsire Bath Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear, defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

I. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(h) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Page 3 of 7

2. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network"

NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties"

Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network/ — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of

an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

3. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched" CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green

North Comments

Name: Kim Surtees

Representor No: PRS01683 **Representation ID:** REP03822

infrastructure plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites. • 2130 — CHURCH LANE: beep "AMBER" or reclassify as "RED" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Kim Surtees

Representor No: PRS01683 Representation ID: REP03822

Question Ref: Unspecified

I would like to express my views on various sites in the North Leeds area which have recently been assessed for suitability for housing development under the Local Development Framework, currently open to public consultation.

I comment on a number of sites, but primarily my objection is to the development of sites 1178A and site 1178B, 1178A suggested to be allocated Green on the proposed plan. This site should not be classed as suitable for development for a number of valid reasons which I will explain, referring to the provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CV) and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF"). I am no doubt you will be aware that there is a huge public outcry at such unnecessary devastation of our vital Green Belt land, and this opinion is staunchly supported by Cllr Barry Anderson and Mr Greg Mulholland MP. I fully endorse Mr Mulholland's questioning as to the methodology which has been used to arrive at the amount of housing required in Leeds which seems astronomical. I would be interested to know your comments following the work of Dr Rachael Unsworth at the University of Leeds who suggests that the planning process should be based on future rejections rather than on historic patterns of demand. Instead we should be looking to develop new kinds of communities, which minimise the need to travel and are energy efficient, on brownfield sites in central locations.

It is interesting to note that site 1178a is one of only 13 out of 73 sites in the area to score 6 or below out of 15 points for the suitability of the local infrastructure. It is the only site with such a low score to be approved for development. The local road network, schooling facilities, shopping facilities, medical support and general amenities are hugely insufficient to cope with this massive increase in housing. The Adel area is already supporting Leeds growth with the developments of Boddington Hall, Church Lane, Governments Buildings and Eastmoor. Once this volume of houses is occupied, the area will already be beyond capacity without further developments over the next 15 years.

Page 1 of 7

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning PM-1c/para 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... The district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched" Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of *Britton v 101*; the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch
B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site 1178A objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yhorsire Bath Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear, defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

I. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(h) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Page 3 of 7

2. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria..., locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network"

NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties"

Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network/ — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of

an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

3. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment..., is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched" CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure..., is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green

North Comments

Name: Kim Surtees

Representor No: PRS01683 **Representation ID:** REP03822

infrastructure plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Peter Surtees

Representor No: PRS02856 Representation ID: REP05407

Question Ref: H1

Building developments in North Leeds

I am aware that there is a need for more housing in Leeds and that 8000 – 9000 are needed in the Northern part of Leeds to serve the growing population. What deeply concerns me regarding the development of land at Site Ref. 1033 is that there is no provision for building other than for housing development. This will undoubtedly mean more pressure on the already inadequate and outdated infrastructure.

I ask that this land is reallocated to 'RED' until a better scheme can be proposed.

I trust the above will be given due consideration and await your reply.

Question Ref: H1

I am aware that there is a need for more housing in Leeds and that 8000 – 9000 are needed in the Northern part of Leeds to serve the growing population. What deeply concerns me regarding the development of land at Site Ref. 1299A is that there is no provision for building other than for housing development. This will undoubtedly mean more pressure on the already inadequate and outdated infrastructure.

I trust the above will be given due consideration and await your reply.

Question Ref: H4

Building developments in North Leeds

I am aware that there is a need for more housing in Leeds and that 8000 – 9000 are needed in the Northern part of Leeds to serve the growing population. What deeply concerns me regarding the development of land at Site Ref. 2130 is that there is no provision for building other than for housing development. This will undoubtedly mean more pressure on the already inadequate and outdated infrastructure.

I ask that this land is reallocated to 'RED' until a better scheme can be proposed.

I trust the above will be given due consideration and await your reply.

Question Ref: General comment

Roads

Residents complain of cut through traffic speeding along estate roads. What is being done to improve the main arterial and ring roads? The Increased population will need a significant number of new jobs. How can we expect economy growth in Leeds with a poor road network?

Shops

I understand that the planners/councillors do not want another corner shop arrangement similar to the Adel post office/mini market. This is a continual source of congestion due to inadequate parking. This will only get busier. Consideration should be given to the concept of running a service road parallel to the Otley Road along the front of Bodington hall and the government land with some suitable shops and parking to serve the passing trade.

1/2

D1 use

Schools

The local primary schools are oversubscribed. Children already have to travel out of the area to get a place. What is being done to provide extra places in the area?

Places of worship/community centres

Local governments are striving to create and maintain stable and caring communities. How can this be achieved when there is no provision made for D1 use?

My concern perhaps could be summed up:

1. That there is a total lack of overall planning in the north Leeds area.

2. That, if planning approval is granted for these huge areas of housing without consideration for other needs to serve the larger population, we will have effectively created a poor quality area which will be unattractive for people to live.

3. Future provision for D1 use and improved road network will be difficult to add later as there has been no fore thought for these essential needs.

North Comments

Name: Peter Surtees

Representor No: PRS02856 Representation ID: REP05716

Question Ref: H1

Dear Sirs

Building developments in North Leeds

I am aware that there is a need for more housing in Leeds and that 8000 – 9000 are needed in the Northern part of Leeds to serve the growing population. What deeply concerns me regarding the development of land at Site Ref.1033 is that there is no provision for building other than for housing development. This will undoubtedly mean more pressure on the already inadequate and outdated infrastructure.

Roads

Residents complain of cut through traffic speeding along estate roads. What is being done to improve the main arterial and ring roads? The increased population will need a significant number of new jobs. How can we expect economy growth in Leeds with a poor road network?

Shops

I understand that the planners/councillors do not want another corner shop arrangement similar to the Adel post office/mini market. This is a continual source of congestion due to inadequate parking. This will only get busier. Consideration should be given to the concept of running a service road parallel to the Otley Road along the front of Bodington hall and the government land with some suitable shops and parking to serve the passing trade.

1/2

D1 use

Schools

The local primary schools are oversubscribed. Children already have to travel out of the area to get a place. What is being done to provide extra places in the area?

Places of worship/community centres

Local governments are striving to create and maintain stable and caring communities. How can this be achieved when there is no provision made for D1 use?

My concern perhaps could be summed up:

1. That there is a total lack of overall planning in the north Leeds area.

2. That, if planning approval is granted for these huge areas of housing without consideration for other needs to serve the larger population, we will have effectively created a poor quality area which will be unattractive for people to live.

3. Future provision for D1 use and improved road network will be difficult to add later as there has been no fore thought for these essential needs.

I ask that this land is reallocated to 'RED' until a better scheme can be proposed.

I trust the above will be given due consideration and await your reply.

Question Ref: H1

Building developments in North Leeds

I am aware that there is a need for more housing in Leeds and that 8000 – 9000 are needed in the Northern part of Leeds to serve the growing population. What deeply concerns me regarding the development of land at Site Ref. 1299A is that there is no provision for building other than for housing development. This will undoubtedly mean more pressure on the already inadequate and outdated infrastructure.

Roads

Residents complain of cut through traffic speeding along estate roads. What is being done to improve the main arterial and ring roads? The increased population will need a significant number of new jobs. How can we expect economy growth in Leeds with a poor road network?

Shops

I understand that the planners/councillors do not want another corner shop arrangement similar to the Adel post office/mini market. This is a continual source of congestion due to inadequate parking. This will only get busier. Consideration should be given to the concept of running a service road parallel to the Otley Road along the front of Bodington hall and the government land with some suitable shops and parking to serve the passing trade.

1/2

D1 use

Schools

The local primary schools are oversubscribed. Children already have to travel out of the area to get a place. What is being done to provide extra places in the area?

Places of worship/community centres

Local governments are striving to create and maintain stable and caring communities. How can this be achieved when there is no provision made for D1 use?

My concern perhaps could be summed up:

1. That there is a total lack of overall planning in the north Leeds area.

2. That, if planning approval is granted for these huge areas of housing without consideration for other needs to serve the larger population, we will have effectively created a poor quality area which will be unattractive for people to live.

3. Future provision for D1 use and improved road network will be difficult to add later as there has been no fore thought for these essential needs.

North Comments

Name: Peter Surtees

Representor No: PRS02856 Representation ID: REP05716

Question Ref: H4

Dear Sirs

Building developments in North Leeds

I am aware that there is a need for more housing in Leeds and that 8000 – 9000 are needed in the Northern part of Leeds to serve the growing population. What deeply concerns me regarding the development of land at Site Ref. 2130 is that there is no provision for building other than for housing development. This will undoubtedly mean more pressure on the already inadequate and outdated infrastructure.

Roads

Residents complain of cut through traffic speeding along estate roads. What is being done to improve the main arterial and ring roads? The increased population will need a significant number of new jobs. How can we expect economy growth in Leeds with a poor road network?

Shops

I understand that the planners/councillors do not want another corner shop arrangement similar to the Adel post office/mini market. This is a continual source of congestion due to inadequate parking. This will only get busier. Consideration should be given to the concept of running a service road parallel to the Otley Road along the front of Bodington hall and the government land with some suitable shops and parking to serve the passing trade.

1/2

D1 use

Schools

The local primary schools are oversubscribed. Children already have to travel out of the area to get a place. What is being done to provide extra places in the area?

Places of worship/community centres

Local governments are striving to create and maintain stable and caring communities. How can this be achieved when there is no provision made for D1 use?

My concern perhaps could be summed up:

1. That there is a total lack of overall planning in the north Leeds area.

2. That, if planning approval is granted for these huge areas of housing without consideration for other needs to serve the larger population, we will have effectively created a poor quality area which will be unattractive for people to live.

3. Future provision for D1 use and improved road network will be difficult to add later as there has been no fore thought for these essential needs.

I ask that this land is reallocated to 'RED' until a better scheme can be proposed.

I trust the above will be given due consideration and await your reply.

North Comments

Name: Jonathan Sutcliffe

Representor No: PRS05510 Representation ID: REP06151

Question Ref: H7

I gather you have supported the protection of Hunger Hills from development. This is an important green space which is regularly enjoyed by residents of Leeds. This beautiful woodland and adjoining area contributes hugely to the positive aspects of living in this community. It would be a great shame to allow any encroachment.

I applaud your decision.

North Comments

Name: Kathryn Sutcliffe

Representor No: PRS05683 **Representation ID:** REP06348

Question Ref: H7

I write to object most strongly to the intention of allowing any development to this parcel of green field land.

Walkers currently enjoy unfettered access to the conservation area from Woodside and Outwood Lane. The development will reduce the amount of open space and in effect segregate and considerably diminish two areas of open space in what is a relatively small conservation area. Walkers will have to traverse a housing estate with increased hazards, necessitating dogs to be kept on leads and children to be closely monitored. I work at the Methodist pre-school on Outwood Lane and the children frequently utilise the public open space enjoying woodland walks and nature rambles as part of the Early Years National Curriculum. This will not be the case if a housing estate is created forming a hazardous division between the open field and the woods.

Outwood Lane is narrow and winding and visibility is restricted in both directions. The road to the north of the Lane will not allow two cars to pass and cannot be widened at the blind corner where Ostlers Barn stands. In my view allowing the development to proceed will considerably increase the chances of accidents on Outwood Lane, which forms a conduit to Woodside, and the Station Road area of Horsforth from the A65. Traffic on the lane can be substantial (outside of the school holidays when the developer's survey was carried out). Local office workers park their cars for most of the day and parents escorting children to the playgroup have reported that it is already very dangerous to cross the lane. Any increase in the volume of traffic will exacerbate these dangers. In the winter the lane is never gritted and becomes exceedingly dangerous.

Consideration must be given given to the impact on flora and fauna. Especially the bats that roost in this area and are a protected species. The trees that whilst sound in a woodland setting would no doubt be condemned if positioned on a housing estate as was the case for the trees destroyed 25 years ago when the adjacent Bellwood housing development was constructed.

The "village" of Horsforth does not have adequate facilities to cope with the increase in demands on it from the Clarion site development and this proposed Outwood Lane development. From pre to senior, the schools are already oversubscribed without this influx. The road network is frequently bottle necked. There are insufficient numbers of doctors or dentists.

There are several alternative brown field sites outside the conservation area that should be considered for development before consideration is paid to more picturesque green field sights. Our green and pleasant land is disappearing fast; please retain this small area for the enjoyment of our children. I appreciate the importance of good housing but equally fundamental is the health and well being of our children who need space to play in comparative safety.

North Comments

Name: Emily Sutherland

Representor No: PRS05709 Representation ID: REP06377

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs NO MORE housing development, strongly agree.

The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem, strongly agree

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand, strongly agree

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this, strongly agree

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat, strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Susan Swales

Representor No: PRS05336 **Representation ID:** REP05933

Question Ref: H4

I disagree with the clasification of site 1202 as having potential for housing. This is Green Belt land and a Green Corridor for an array of wildlife in addition to the current public access enjoyed by local residents . The suggestion that a possible 185 homes could be built in an area that is currently having 500 homes built at the Sandos site and a large developement at the Kirkstal Forge site would put too much pressure on the current schools, services and roads in the area. The site floods in bad weather due to the various underground streams in the area and would need extensive drainage which would cause problems for the neighbouring houses.

North Comments

Name: Susan Swales

Representor No: PRS05336 **Representation ID:** REP06508

Question Ref: H4

I disagree with the clasification of site 1202 as having potential for housing. This is Green Belt land and a Green Corridor for an array of wildlife in addition to the current public access enjoyed by local residents . The suggestion that a possible 185 homes could be built in an area that is currently having 500 homes built at the Sandos site and a large developement at the Kirkstal Forge site would put too much pressure on the current schools, services and roads in the area. The site floods in bad weather due to the various underground streams in the area and would need extensive drainage which would cause problems for the neighbouring houses.

North Comments

Name: Anna Sweeney

Representor No: PRS05848 **Representation ID:** REP06561

Question Ref: H4

I am writing to express my opposition to your classification of the above site as having potential for 185 houses. I live [x] very close to this site, [x]

My main concern is the access to the site and the increase in traffic it would cause. There appear to be only three options for access:

Off Victoria Avenue, through Site 731 which is currently a field but has planning permission for 15 properties

Via Victoria Crescent, which at present is a cul de sac ending at Horsforth Newlaithes Primary School

Off the Outer Ring Road past Leeds City College Horsforth campus.

The first option would mean more traffic coming off the roundabout where the Ring Road meets the A65. This is already at overcapacity and set to get worse when the Clariant development of over 500 houses is completed.

The second option causes me particular concern as a school governor and parent of three children attending Horsforth Newlaithes Primary School. Making Victoria Crescent into a through road would mean an increase in the volume and speed of traffic and I am very concerned for the safety of children outside the school should that be the case.

The third option would again mean more traffic on the Outer Ring Road/A65 roundabout.

My secondary concern is the effect on the local amenity. At the moment, Site 1202 is fields, on which cows graze, and which form a beautiful and peaceful backdrop to the school and an area which is popular with dog walkers. Building on this would reduce the amount of open space and increase the noise. It may also have an effect on the drainage. The school is at the bottom of the site, which is a hill, and if built on, may cause water to run down the hill into the school grounds, making them muddy and unsuitable for the children to play out on,

For these reasons I oppose the classification of this site as suitable for housing.

North Comments

Name: Christopher Swift

Representor No: PRS05685 Representation ID: REP06350

Question Ref: H7

I agree with the Leeds City Council RED classification with regard to 1310 Land at Outwood Lane ,Horsforth LS18. This site is a green field and an important link in a green corridor in the Aire valley. The proposed site is accessed from a narrow lane which already experiences many traffic problems and any such access would be detrimental and dangerous to both road users and pedestrians.

North Comments

Name: Joanne Sykes

Representor No: PRS00464 **Representation ID:** REP02411

Question Ref: G17

2055 - I expect to see these important allotments retained for the good of our community.

North Comments

Name: Nicholas Sykes

Representor No: PRS00465 **Representation ID:** REP02414

Question Ref: G17

2055 - It should be retained as greenspace for ever!

North Comments

Name: Louis Sykes

Representor No: PRS00469 **Representation ID:** REP02417

Question Ref: G17

2055 - This area of land should be retained as greenspace. The allotments are a community asset and must be protected.

North Comments

Name: Jane Sykes

Representor No: PRS00479 Representation ID: REP00410

Question Ref: G2

n

Question Ref: G3

n

Question Ref: G4

n

Question Ref: G5

n

Question Ref: G6

n

Question Ref: CCG1

n

Question Ref: CCG2

n

Question Ref: G10

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G11

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G12

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G13

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G14

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G15

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G16

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G17

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G17

the allotments are protected and this protection should be honoured and any thought of releasing the site for housing must be dismissed.

Question Ref: G18

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G19

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G20

Retained for greenspace

North Comments

Name: Jane Sykes

Representor No: PRS00479 **Representation ID:** REP00410

Question Ref: G9

0

Question Ref: G10

0

North Comments

Name: Jane Sykes

Representor No: PRS00479 **Representation ID:** REP02428

Question Ref: G17

I think that this land should be retained as greenspace and the allotments should be protected.

North Comments

Name: Lois Sykes

Representor No: PRS02130 **Representation ID:** REP04353

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree I live on the street which will become the access route, there is no room now for parked cars, nevermind with 400+ cars driving in and out everyday !!! The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Roads around the Moseley Woods are not wide enough to hold the traffic Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree Health care waiting lists for appointments for current patients are already up to 2 weeks. Nevermind with 200 more families attending The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree I am unaware what will happen by the railway lines but when it rains it floods down my street Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat The field at the bottom holds wildlife such as foxes, which are increasing in numbers, where will they go?.

North Comments

Name: Debbie Sykes

Representor No: PRS02131 Representation ID: REP00112

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H2

I strongly disagree with site 1199 which is land off moseley wood gardens in cookridge. I live on moseley wood rise the narrow cul-de-sac with just 8 semi detached houses on. You can not be serious that you are going to open the fence and build 200 houses there. 200 houses means a minimum of 400 cars. The street is far too narrow. I live at number 6 and when the house opposite has there son come to visit on a weekend I am unable to get my car off my drive without a considerable amount of manouvering. When purchasing this house over 20 years ago we purchased it because it was in a quite cul-de-sac. Surley we have some rights as you are now going to take that way from us. In winter the smallest amount of snow fall causes the street to come to a stand still as it is the lowest point in cookridge. It is impossible to get up the street so how 400 cars are going to get up there is simply a joke. Leaving them abandoned on moseley wood gardens would caused serious accidents. On a saturday if a car is parked on the street the bin men can't get down the street and on occasion have refused to empty the bins can you imagine if that was a fire engine! you really have not thought this throu. The wagons coming along woodhill road and green land are dangerous to the local school as if that road is not dangerous enough. Wagons coming along moseley wood gardens will not be able to get through if the cars are parked anything like they were yesterday it is a maze that you carefully have to weave in and out of in a car the big diggers and trucks will cause damage to parked cars that goes without saying. I would also like to ask what doctors all these new houses are going to go to. I rang the doctors yesterday for my daughter and was told I had to wait a week for an appointment. What is it going to be like with a minimum of 400 more people. I understand building has to go ahead with the ever increasing population but this is rediculous. Dangerous with no real thought put into it.

Question Ref: H3

n/a

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

I am only refering to the moseley wood gardens site

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Obviously the golf course and surrounding land is coded red for the right reason

Question Ref: H8

Site 1199 as previously mentioned

Question Ref: H11

Site 1199 should not go ahead at all

Question Ref: H13

n/a

Question Ref: H14

n/a

Question Ref: H15

n/a

Question Ref: General comment

I could carry on with a million reasons why you should noy build in the field and will if nessesary

North Comments

Name: Debbie Sykes

Representor No: PRS02131 **Representation ID:** REP04355

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree The roads are too busy as it is. The schools, Doctors, Dentists etc are all full its ridiculous The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Moseley Wood Gardens is a nightmare as it is. You have to have your wits about you when driving along there without another 400 cars + Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree It took me 8 days to get an appointment for my 13 year old daughter with the doctor The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree We watch the water stream down the middle of the street into the fields on many occasions. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree We have crested newts in our pond which have come from the beck.

North Comments

Name: T K Szulecka

Representor No: PRS02580 **Representation ID:** REP04874

Question Ref: H1

- 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: T K Szulecka

Representor No: PRS02580 Representation ID: REP04874

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: T K Szulecka

Representor No: PRS02580 Representation ID: REP04874

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: T K Szulecka

Representor No: PRS02580 **Representation ID:** REP04874

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: T K Szulecka

Representor No: PRS02580 Representation ID: REP04874

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: T K Szulecka

Representor No: PRS02580 Representation ID: REP04874

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: T K Szulecka

Representor No: PRS02580 **Representation ID:** REP04874

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Robin & Suzanne Tait

Representor No: PRS00973 Representation ID: REP03022

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.
Strongly agree

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.
Strongly agree

I live on Green Lane & it will cause more congestion at the MW Gdns junction.

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.
Strongly agree

All services are full/oversubscribed & have waiting lists.

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.
Strongly agree

It is very boggy near the beck in the fields especially in winter.

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

We need to protect the wildlife in the fields.

North Comments

Name: Mi Tate

Representor No: PRS01393 Representation ID: REP03518

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Mi Tate

Representor No: PRS01393 Representation ID: REP03518

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Mi Tate

Representor No: PRS01393 Representation ID: REP03518

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Mi Tate

Representor No: PRS01393 Representation ID: REP03518

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Mi Tate

Representor No: PRS01393 Representation ID: REP03518

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Mi Tate

Representor No: PRS01393 Representation ID: REP03518

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Pauline Tate

Representor No: PRS03333 Representation ID: REP01818

Question Ref: G1

Keep them green

Question Ref: G2

n

Question Ref: G2

leave well alone

Question Ref: G3

n

Question Ref: G4

y

Question Ref: G4

to improve areas

Question Ref: G5

n

Question Ref: G5

Many houses are already left empty - they need refurbishing and letting first

Question Ref: G6

y

Question Ref: G6

More areas of play and activity for young people

Question Ref: CCG1

n

Question Ref: CCG2

n

Question Ref: G9

0

Question Ref: G10

0

Question Ref: G8

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G9

Retained for greenspace

North Comments

Name: Sharon Tate

Representor No: PRS06096 Representation ID: REP06950

Question Ref: H7

Site Allocation Consultation
SHLAA Reference 1015 Hunger Hills

I am writing in support of the Council Officers' decision with respect to SHLAA Reference 1015 Hunger Hills.

I lived in Horsforth as a child where I always enjoyed playing in the woods and fields around Hunger Hills. Indeed my own children are now enjoying the green space that Hunger hills provides. They provide a fantastic, natural playground for my children and one of the few places to go sledging in Horsforth in the winter.

The woods are an historic, natural beauty and it would be sad to see them destroyed by further development in the area. The woods were planted in 1785 by Walter Stanhope and were donated to the people of Horsforth in 1947. They should be maintained for the benefit of future generations to enjoy.

The woods are ecologically important as they provide a safe habitat for many animals (squirrels, foxes, mice etc), birds (including jays, woodpeckers, owls, swifts and swallows) and bats. It provides a home to several native trees including oak, beeches, limes, rowan and holly and in the springtime the ground is carpeted in bluebells.

As a local resident I was concerned about the impact of further development in the area particularly in view of the local transport network:-

-the ring road from Horsforth to Pudsey already grinds to a halt during the rush hours and this situation will worsen with the c.500 properties that are to be built on the former Clariant site.

-similarly it can take up to an hour to travel into Leeds via A65 in rush hour because of the volume of traffic already on the roads.

-bus lanes along the A65 have reduced the commuting time from Horsforth to Leeds slightly but it still takes the best part of an hour if travelling at peak times.

-travelling by train is quicker but less comfortable because often I have to stand because of the lack of carriages.

Further development in the area will only have a detrimental impact on the transport network.

Finally, as a parent I am concerned about the impact on the local schools which are already straining to accommodate children in the area.

I believe that Hunger Hills should be left as a place of natural beauty for future generations to enjoy. I urge you not to let developers spoil this green space.

North Comments

Name: Katy Taverner

Representor No: PRS04704 **Representation ID:** REP00141

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

I believe the Cookridge area is built up to a maximum, the roads and infrastructure is not adequate to support more housing development. I believe there are opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites that already exist in Leeds to meet future demands in housing.

Question Ref: H2

1199 Land Off Moseley Wood Gardens Leeds 16. Currently Cookridge is a large sprawling housing area, the fields are marked for development and are a haven for wildlife. The immediate roads would become more congested, the main thoroughfare into Leeds city centre is the A660 one of the most congested roads in Leeds. There are limited other facilities in Cookridge, such as both schooling. If the area is developed, impermeable structures such as roads and roof space will increase flood risk, and the proposed site would cause huge risk to the railway line which is at the bottom of the sloping plot of land. In terms of where we would build new houses within the existing city, there are currently a lot of vacant houses and disused sites, which could be brought back into use or re-developed.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

1151 Cookridge Lane 3044 Cookridge Hall Golf 3360 Cookridge Hall The sites around Cookridge coded red I agree with not being developed. Cookridge does not have the roads and services to support further development. Wild life and green space should be protected and there are more suitable brownfield sites around Leeds that could be more suitable options.

North Comments

Name: Taylor Wimpey

Representor No: PRS05168 **Representation ID:** REP06878

Question Ref: H1

1079 - objection to red. Should be green.

Long Causeway, Adel is a well contained site which limits the potential for sprawl and links well with the settlement. The site has the potential to round off the settlement form, and therefore it should be removed from the Green Belt.

The site would provide a sustainable extension to the Main Urban Area. In the North Leeds housing market area, development could make a significant contribution towards the housing requirement of 6,000 dwellings.

Leeds City Council have state in their assessment that this site does not meet the public transport accessibility standards. The standard is that sites should be within a 5 min walk (400m) to a bus stop offering a 15 min service frequency. The bus stops on Sir George Martin Drive are only a 300m walk away from the site and the 28 bus is every 20 minutes. Other bus stops and bus services can be found 700m away from the site (under a 10 minute walk) on Otley Road are at a frequency of every 7-8 minutes. Therefor we consider the site to have excellent accessibility to bus services especially into Leeds City Centre. The site is close to Adel local centre, schools, health facilities and recreation grounds.

There are no significant environmental or physical constraints on site that would preclude its development. A range of benefits could be delivered including:

- ☐ Delivery of new family housing including open market homes and affordable housing
- ☐ Direct and indirect construction jobs
- ☐ Section 106 monies in respect of transport, education and public open space
- ☐ Increased expenditure in the local economy
- ☐ New Homes Bonus
- ☐ Provision of new public open space

The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47). The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and a national housebuilder. The site is in a sustainable location, suitable for the delivery of housing as detailed in this response. There are no insurmountable physical problems or limitations and as such the site is considered to be suitable for housing. It is considered that this is an achievable site, which has a realistic prospect of being delivered within 5 years; there are no known viability issues restricting the site from coming forward.

For the reasons set out above, we consider this site should be rated as Green and allocated for housing.

For additional information/comments, see full representation.

Question Ref: H2

1079 - objection to red. Should be green.

Long Causeway, Adel is a well contained site which limits the potential for sprawl and links well with the settlement. The site has the potential to round off the settlement form, and therefore it should be removed from the Green Belt.

The site would provide a sustainable extension to the Main Urban Area. In the North Leeds housing market area, development could make a significant contribution towards the housing requirement of 6,000 dwellings.

Leeds City Council have state in their assessment that this site does not meet the public transport accessibility standards. The standard is that sites should be within a 5 min walk (400m) to a bus stop offering a 15 min service frequency. The bus stops on Sir George Martin Drive are only a 300m walk away from the site and the 28 bus is every 20 minutes. Other bus stops and bus services can be found 700m away from the site (under a 10 minute walk) on Otley Road are at a frequency of every 7-8 minutes. Therefor we consider the site to have excellent accessibility to bus services especially into Leeds City Centre. The site is close to Adel local centre, schools, health facilities and recreation grounds.

There are no significant environmental or physical constraints on site that would preclude its development. A range of benefits could be delivered including:

- ☐ Delivery of new family housing including open market homes and affordable housing
- ☐ Direct and indirect construction jobs
- ☐ Section 106 monies in respect of transport, education and public open space
- ☐ Increased expenditure in the local economy
- ☐ New Homes Bonus
- ☐ Provision of new public open space

The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47). The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and a national housebuilder. The site is in a sustainable location, suitable for the delivery of housing as detailed in this response. There are no insurmountable physical problems or limitations and as such the site is considered to be suitable for housing. It is considered that this is an achievable site, which has a realistic prospect of being delivered within 5 years; there are no known viability issues restricting the site from coming forward.

For the reasons set out above, we consider this site should be rated as Green and allocated for housing.

For additional information/comments, see full representation.

North Comments

Name: Taylor Wimpey

Representor No: PRS05168 **Representation ID:** REP06878

Question Ref: H7

1079 - objection to red. Should be green.

Long Causeway, Adel is a well contained site which limits the potential for sprawl and links well with the settlement. The site has the potential to round off the settlement form, and therefore it should be removed from the Green Belt.

The site would provide a sustainable extension to the Main Urban Area. In the North Leeds housing market area, development could make a significant contribution towards the housing requirement of 6,000 dwellings.

Leeds City Council have state in their assessment that this site does not meet the public transport accessibility standards. The standard is that sites should be within a 5 min walk (400m) to a bus stop offering a 15 min service frequency. The bus stops on Sir George Martin Drive are only a 300m walk away from the site and the 28 bus is every 20 minutes. Other bus stops and bus services can be found 700m away from the site (under a 10 minute walk) on Otley Road are at a frequency of every 7-8 minutes. Therefor we consider the site to have excellent accessibility to bus services especially into Leeds City Centre. The site is close to Adel local centre, schools, health facilities and recreation grounds.

There are no significant environmental or physical constraints on site that would preclude its development. A range of benefits could be delivered including:

- ☐ Delivery of new family housing including open market homes and affordable housing
- ☐ Direct and indirect construction jobs
- ☐ Section 106 monies in respect of transport, education and public open space
- ☐ Increased expenditure in the local economy
- ☐ New Homes Bonus
- ☐ Provision of new public open space

The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47). The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and a national housebuilder. The site is in a sustainable location, suitable for the delivery of housing as detailed in this response. There are no insurmountable physical problems or limitations and as such the site is considered to be suitable for housing. It is considered that this is an achievable site, which has a realistic prospect of being delivered within 5 years; there are no known viability issues restricting the site from coming forward.

For the reasons set out above, we consider this site should be rated as Green and allocated for housing.

For additional information/comments, see full representation.

Question Ref: H8

1079 - objection to red. Should be green.

Long Causeway, Adel is a well contained site which limits the potential for sprawl and links well with the settlement. The site has the potential to round off the settlement form, and therefore it should be removed from the Green Belt.

The site would provide a sustainable extension to the Main Urban Area. In the North Leeds housing market area, development could make a significant contribution towards the housing requirement of 6,000 dwellings.

Leeds City Council have state in their assessment that this site does not meet the public transport accessibility standards. The standard is that sites should be within a 5 min walk (400m) to a bus stop offering a 15 min service frequency. The bus stops on Sir George Martin Drive are only a 300m walk away from the site and the 28 bus is every 20 minutes. Other bus stops and bus services can be found 700m away from the site (under a 10 minute walk) on Otley Road are at a frequency of every 7-8 minutes. Therefor we consider the site to have excellent accessibility to bus services especially into Leeds City Centre. The site is close to Adel local centre, schools, health facilities and recreation grounds.

There are no significant environmental or physical constraints on site that would preclude its development. A range of benefits could be delivered including:

- ☐ Delivery of new family housing including open market homes and affordable housing
- ☐ Direct and indirect construction jobs
- ☐ Section 106 monies in respect of transport, education and public open space
- ☐ Increased expenditure in the local economy
- ☐ New Homes Bonus
- ☐ Provision of new public open space

The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47). The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and a national housebuilder. The site is in a sustainable location, suitable for the delivery of housing as detailed in this response. There are no insurmountable physical problems or limitations and as such the site is considered to be suitable for housing. It is considered that this is an achievable site, which has a realistic prospect of being delivered within 5 years; there are no known viability issues restricting the site from coming forward.

For the reasons set out above, we consider this site should be rated as Green and allocated for housing.

For additional information/comments, see full representation.

North Comments

Name: Taylor Wimpey

Representor No: PRS05168 **Representation ID:** REP07268

Question Ref: H1

1199 - Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge

We support the colour coding of 1199 as green for the following reasons as set out below. We believe that the site should be allocated for circa 200 dwellings in the Site Allocations Plan. The site comprises of flat greenfield open land which is bounded to the south east by residential houses, to the west by the railway line and the north by field boundary and dense tree coverage. The site is adjacent to the suburb of Cookridge and is approximately 2.2km away from the town of Horsforth. In Cookridge, approximately 420m away from the site on Green Lane is a Tesco Express, Post Office, Flower Shop, Village Hall and Church. In Horsforth there are a range of shops and services such as a Morrisons Supermarket, banks, building societies, estate agents, hairdressers and restaurants. There are also numerous community and leisure facilities in Horsforth such as a library and more churches. The site is 1.5km away from the Holt Park District Centre, which has an ASDA, a fish and chip shop and dental surgery. The site has good access to public transport, education and health facilities. The site is approximately 1.3km away from Horsforth Train Station where regular services to Leeds, Harrogate and York can be accessed.

- Services to Leeds are every 30 minutes (more at peak times)
- Services to Knaresborough via Harrogate are every 15 minutes
- Services to York via Harrogate are every hour

There are bus stops on Green Lane, approximately 550m from the site, where the following bus services can be accessed:

- 6 – Leeds Bus Station to Holt Park Leisure Centre every 10 minutes
 - 31 – Horsforth Town Street to Holt Park every 2 hours
 - 940 – Holt Park to Wharfedale Hospital via Green Lane, Bramhope, Pool in Wharfedale and Otley Bus Station every hour and 14 minutes
- The site is well placed to access local educational facilities. The nearest Primary School Cookridge Holy Trinity Church of England Primary School is 450m away and Cookridge Primary school 900m away. The nearest Secondary Schools are Ralph Thorsby which is 1.3km away in Holt Park and Horsforth School, 2.1km away.

With regard to health facilities; the closest GPs to the site are High Field Surgery 1.4km away on Holtdale Approach and The New Croft Surgery 2.3km away on Broadgate Lane. The closest dental surgery is Horsforth Dental Practice 1.4km away on Troy Road, Holt Park Dental Practice, 1.5km away and Horsforth Smile Clinic, 2.7km away. There are a number of chemists and opticians in Horsforth Town centre.

As part of our ongoing pre-planning application work, transport consultants confirm a scheme for up to 200 dwellings can be developed off a single access point located on Moseley Wood Rise. For the avoidance of doubt, the site does not require a second vehicular access. The development team are looking at an emergency vehicle access in another location along with additional footpath connections.

[Representation sets out Core Strategy policies].

In Aireborough the Draft Core Strategy apportions 2,300 dwellings as being required throughout the plan period. Regardless of our objections to the overall housing requirement, Aireborough has outstanding permissions and allocations equating to 539 dwellings, this is only 20% of the requirement. The total number of 'Green' sites in this housing market area has a capacity for 806 dwellings, some 35% of the requirement. Based on this, it is clear that the Council will need to allocate all the identified 'Green' sites in Aireborough in order to achieve the dwelling requirement. In North Leeds the Draft Core Strategy apportions 6,000 dwellings as being required throughout the plan period. Regardless of our objections to the overall housing requirement, North Leeds has outstanding permissions and allocations equating to 2,911 dwellings, this is only 49% of the requirement. The total number of 'Green' sites in this housing market area has a capacity for 1,111 dwellings, some 19% of the requirement. Based on this, it is clear that the Council will need to allocate all the identified 'Green' sites in North Leeds in order to achieve the dwelling requirement.

The allocation of this site for housing development is consistent with the adopted National Planning Policy Framework. [Representation sets out NPPF policy]. The development of the site is consistent with these objectives.

Conclusions

We object to the splitting of this site across housing market areas and consider it should all be within the North Leeds housing market area. The part of the site in the Aireborough housing market area (to the west) is in fact undevelopable being close to the railway line and on land beyond the stream. The boundary revision appears to include an area of land which is in the Green Belt. The PAS site covers an area of 9.9ha and Green Belt land is not necessary for the development of this site. This site is currently designated as safeguarded land (PAS) and the Core Strategy confirms that PAS sites will be one of the prime sources for housing allocations. The site is adjacent to the Main Urban Area and is mainly within the North Leeds housing market area which has a housing requirement of 6,000 dwellings over the plan period. The allocation of this site would comply with the policies in the emerging Core Strategy. This site is in a sustainable location close to local shops and services, public transport links, schools, health facilities and employment areas.

A planning application is currently being prepared for this site which includes circa 200 dwellings, areas of public open space and greenspace. A number of technical assessments have been undertaken and there are no significant environmental or physical constraints on site which would prevent development. A range of benefits could be delivered including:

- Delivery of new family housing including open market homes and affordable housing
- Direct and indirect construction jobs
- 106 monies in transport, education, public open space
- Increased expenditure in the local economy
- New Homes Bonus
- Provision of new public open space

For the avoidance of doubt, a development of up to 200 dwellings can be served off a single point of access off Moseley Wood Rise.

The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47). The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and a national housebuilder. The site is in a sustainable location, suitable for the delivery of housing as detailed in this response. There are no insurmountable physical problems or limitations and as such the site is considered to be suitable for housing. It is considered that this is an achievable site, which has a realistic prospect of being delivered within 5 years; there are no known viability issues restricting the site from coming forward.

Question Ref: H11

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

North Comments

Name: Taylor Wimpey

Representor No: PRS05168 **Representation ID:** REP07268

Question Ref: General comment

Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.

North Comments

Name: Malcolm Taylor

Representor No: PRS01803 Representation ID: REP00167

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

SITE REF 1199 - THIS AREA ADJOINS THE EXISTING HEAVILY POPULATED AREA OF COOKRIDGE. THE EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE COOKRIDGE AREA CANNOT COPE WITH A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN POPULATION NUMBERS.

Question Ref: H2

SITE REF 1199 - THIS AREA ADJOINS THE EXISTING HEAVILY POPULATED AREA OF COOKRIDGE. IT WILL IMPACT ON THE ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE WHICH ALREADY IS VERY HEAVILY USED AND IS UNDER CONSTANT REPAIR AS CURRENTLY ON GREEN LANE AND THE ADJOINING STREETS. AT PEAK TIMES THE EXISTING ROADS ARE VERY BUSY SO WITH ANOTHER POTENTIAL 400 CARS (2 PER RESIDENCE) THERE WILL BE BOTTLENECKS AND AN INCREASE IN THE RISKS OF ACCIDENTS. THE FIRE STATION IN COOKRIDGE IS CLOSING DOWN AND SO HOW CAN AN ADDITIONAL 200+ RESIDENCES ON TOP OF THE EXISTING BE SERVICED BY THE EMERGENCY SERVICES? THE CURRENT SCHOOLS IN THE AREA ARE FULL TO CAPACITY AND ARE NOT ABLE TO EXPAND. THERE ARE NO PLANS FOR NEW SCHOOLS SO HOW CAN ADDING 200+ RESIDENCES WITH SOME POTENTIAL 400+ ADDITIONAL CHILDREN (FROM CRECHE THRU TO SECONDARY) BE CATERED FOR WITHOUT CAUSING SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE FAMILIES WHO MOVE INTO THE AREA? THE TARGET AREA IS WELL KNOWN FOR POOR DRAINAGE AND THIS COULD LEAD TO SIGNIFICANT FLOODING ISSUES THAT COULD IMPACT THE RAILWAY LINE AND THE AREA OF HORSFORTH NEAR IT, INCLUDING AGRICULTURAL LAND.

Question Ref: H3

NO

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

N/A

Question Ref: H5

N/A

Question Ref: H6

N/A

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

REF 1151 - COOKRIDGE LANE - NEXT TO ALREADY BUSY THROUGH ROAD FROM COOKRIDGE TO BRAMHOPE WHICH WOULD NOT COPE WITH AN ADDITIONAL VOLUME OF TRAFFIC. POTENTIAL VISUAL IMPACT - WOULD SPOIL EXISTING OPEN VIEWS AND COULD AFFECT EXISTING LEEDS COUNTRY WAY (LCW) WALKWAYS. NO PUBLIC TRANSPORT ON THIS ROAD - NEAREST BUS SERVICE SOME HALF A MILE AWAY. ACCESS TO THE SITE WILL BE DANGEROUS AND PROBLEMATIC DUE TO NARROW MAIN ROAD AND RESTRICTED VIEWS FOR TRAFFIC.

Question Ref: H8

N/A

Question Ref: H9

N/A

Question Ref: H10

AREAS TO THE EAST OF LEEDS WITH ACCESS TO A1, M1, AND A64.

Question Ref: H11

NO

Question Ref: H12

NONE

North Comments

Name: Malcolm Taylor

Representor No: PRS01803 **Representation ID:** REP00167

Question Ref: H13

NO

Question Ref: H14

UNABLE TO COMMENT.

Question Ref: H15

UNABLE TO COMMENT

Question Ref: General comment

RE REF 1151.IF THIS DEVELOPMENT WENT AHEAD THERE WOULD POTENTIALLY BE AN IMPACT ON THE EXISTING ECOLGY, I.E. WILDLIFE (THERE ARE DEER, FOXES, SQUIRRELS, MANY WILD BIRDS INC OWLS); FLORA AND FAUNA, THAT NEED TO BE PROTECTED.THE OVER DEVELOPMENT OF THE AREA WITHOUT ADDING SUBSTANTIAL ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES (SCHOOLS; MEDICAL; SHOPS; BUS ROUTES; EMERGENCY SERVICES; PLAY AREAS FOR YOUNG CHILDREN) WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE CUMULATIVE AFFECT OM THE AREA.

North Comments

Name: Malcolm Taylor

Representor No: PRS01803 Representation ID: REP03971

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. The roads in Cookridge cannot cope with current traffic and are under constant repair. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. We have frields who are being affected primary/junior school places in Otley as no placed in this area. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Irene Taylor

Representor No: PRS01991 **Representation ID:** REP04190

Question Ref: G17

Feed Leeds indicates a commitment from leeds city council to develop local food growing schemes. I do not believe that developing the site of the Stonegate Road allotments is consistent with this. They are valuable, well used resource for the community and therefore this land should be retained for green space.

North Comments

Name: J Taylor

Representor No: PRS02293 **Representation ID:** REP04535

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom Green to Red. Agree Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments. Not enough shops to cater for anymore. Agree the inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem. At certain times the roads are already too busy.

Agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this. Being at the bottom of the hill will get all surface water when it rains.

Agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Don't know what there is.

North Comments

Name: Taylor

Representor No: PRS02463 **Representation ID:** REP04726

Question Ref: H1

1199 – Moseley Bottom, Green to Red. Strongly agree Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Facilities very limited (losing its village character)

Strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. It already is (on Moseley Wood Avenue) a problem more traffic will clearly make it worse - rat runs etc.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Waiting times for appointments have already increased to an unacceptable length (especially doctors) some families with children split between different schools as no places available. No extra buses/ or extended bus routes are to be provided for the proposed development - number 6 bus already unreliable - more cars will be left on our street (parking problem) in order to be near the bus stops.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Too much pressure will occur on different drains/ flooding likely to move to the railway line at the bottom.

Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Destruction of plants/ flora results in fewer insects (eg much endangered bees) finally has an adverse effect on the natural food chain.

North Comments

Name: Richard Taylor

Representor No: PRS03232 **Representation ID:** REP00065

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

Consistent with brownfield sites and highway considerations

Question Ref: H4

y

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

1305 on Outwood Lane has particular highway issues that make development unsuitable - as well as being a greenfield site in a conservation area

Question Ref: H11

Site 626 - Kirkstall Forge - is long overdue to be developed with associated new railway station.

North Comments

Name: Ellspeth Taylor

Representor No: PRS05665 **Representation ID:** REP06330

Question Ref: H7

I am so pleased that the Council's recent Site Allocation Plan has listed site 1310 as not suitable for the allocation of housing. Outwood Lane is such a dangerous road for cars and pedestrians, with two blind corners and some very narrow sections, particularly at the point where this site would be entered. On one occasion, the Fire Services were unable to get down the lane due to the congestion of parked cars, and just a couple of weeks ago the waste collection van was blocked. Cars were parked along the road due to a funeral at the church and only a narrow single lane was available all along the edge of site 1310, leaving cars and the waste van backed up for ten or fifteen minutes.

Likewise, the road is very dangerous in icy weather with a steep hill at either end and another hill in the middle. One neighbour at the foot of this middle hill has had their wall crashed into three times in recent years in icy conditions. I have to leave my car parked on the parallel road during icy weather and walk the children through the woods to get to it each morning, rather than risk their safety at either steep end of the lane.

The BUPA office at one end often has delivery vans parked on yellow lines at their end of the road, making it difficult to access the roundabout at the bottom of the hill, and their staff often park on the blind corner opposite our house, meaning oncoming cars are forced onto the wrong side of the road as they go round this blind corner. There have been two blocks of flats added to the housing on Outwood Lane in the last few years, again adding to the congestion. More vehicles from any further housing would only be a hazard.

Finally, site 1310 is bordered by a footpath linking two sections of woodland, with beautiful views across the Aire Valley. Many people walk their dogs down this footpath, or cycle or run down it and find it to be a beautiful 'breathing space' in busy city life. There is a lot of wildlife, including Red Kites and bats that fly over these fields, which simply wouldn't come there if it became a housing estate. This area has recently been awarded Conservation Status because of these views, wildlife and historic stone houses. If any character is to be preserved in our city, then this section of Outwood Lane should certainly be conserved. People are always surprised to find this little haven when they happen upon it - a visitor to our house in about 1908 remarked in a postcard of this part of Outwood Lane (bordering the current site 1310), that is is 'one of the most beautiful walks in Horsforth'.

North Comments

Name: Mavis Teague

Representor No: PRS01781 Representation ID: REP03950

Question Ref: H7

1310 - Land at Outvood Lane Horsforth

With reference to the above site I totally agree with your classification that this site is unsuitable for the building of houses.

I feel the reasons for this are as follows:

A development of houses would increase the volume of traffic on this already busy road. The road is very narrow by the field, especially on the blind bend by Outwood House. There are already problems with people parking on and near this bend which makes it extremely dangerous.

I feel that the character of this conservation area will be lost as this will take away most of the green area we all enjoy. This open space is frequently used by the public who walk this area and enjoy seeing the wild life and woodland.

North Comments

Name: Kamran Tehrani

Representor No: PRS02582 **Representation ID:** REP04878

Question Ref: H1

- 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Kamran Tehrani

Representor No: PRS02582 Representation ID: REP04878

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Kamran Tehrani

Representor No: PRS02582 Representation ID: REP04878

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Kamran Tehrani

Representor No: PRS02582 **Representation ID:** REP04878

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Kamran Tehrani

Representor No: PRS02582 Representation ID: REP04878

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Kamran Tehrani

Representor No: PRS02582 Representation ID: REP04878

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in not way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: Kamran Tehrani

Representor No: PRS02582 **Representation ID:** REP04878

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Janet Telford

Representor No: PRS02353 **Representation ID:** REP04604

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree Where is the infrastructure; schools Docs etc The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Christine Thackray

Representor No: PRS02148 **Representation ID:** REP04368

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree Schools and Doctors are over stretched now. They cant cope with any more people The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Moseley Wood Gardens is not wide enough for all the traffic the houses will bring Only one entrance Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree Holy Trinity & Cookridge Primary have waiting lists. Doctors - you can wait up to a week to get an appointment now The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree The Railway Line will flood Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly Agree Green is very PC at the moment. Developing this land goes against everything green.

North Comments

Name: The Burford Group

Representor No: PRS05901 Representation ID: REP06651

Question Ref: H1

Site 376

In relation to the Woodside Quarry site (Refs: 376), this site has been colour coded light green (UDP allocations and planning permissions).

We agree this site should be identified as 'light green' as this site is wholly suitable sites to carry forward as an allocation for housing development in the Issues and Options DPD and can deliver new dwellings over the plan period with the main urban area of Leeds. We therefore support the Council's proposal to carry this site forward into the Site Allocations DPD as a housing commitment / allocation.

The site lies in a highly sustainable urban location within the residential area of Horsforth / Ireland Wood in North Leeds and can deliver dwellings.

As evidenced by the technical reports which were submitted to the Council as part of the outline planning application for the site, there are no physical development constraints which would prevent the site coming forward over the plan period.

See representation submitted for full details

Question Ref: H11

Site 376

The Woodside Quarry site (ref: 376) should not be subject to any phasing policy as the site forms part of the Council's existing supply.

See representation submitted for full details

North Comments

Name: Jason Theaker

Representor No: PRS04115 Representation ID: REP01447

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

1, there are 1177 houses planed in this area and of the 2000 in the area a disproportionate amount in in Otley!2, the town cannot cope with this amount of houses. The thousands of extra cars will clog up the already busy pool road. 3, more cars mean more danger for our children on Pool road. There have been two deaths in the last 3 years on this road and it's a high possibility that the massive increase of cars will cause further! My child has already been nearly knocked over crossing on the zebra crossing (which prompted me to write to my MP).

Question Ref: H2

. Site 745 (East of Otley). I would like to see a planning framework in place and have it subject to a public consultation. Reference is not made to the issues identified in the UDP and not being published.... Since the UDP the no progress has been made in addressing these issues. . I'm very concerned that the extra traffic will make the roads very congested and dangerous

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H6

• There are two sites that are currently classified as red should be re-classified to amber...Site 2051B (South West of Eccup Reservoir)• A very large site which is similar with site 2051A located within the Leeds North area. Note there are some inconsistency in the site reference between map and the schedule (the map references have been used).• Located relatively close to the centre of Leeds and good for ommuters• Multiple transport routes into Leeds.• Clearly defined boundaries with existing development to the south and by woodland, golf course or roads elsewhere.• Contained within defensible boundaries to prevent urbansprawl.Site 2054 (South East of Eccup Reservoir)• This large site is adjacent to site 2053B, a large amber classified site located within the Leeds North area.• Located relatively close to the centre of Leeds.• Far better access into Leeds than other sites in Outer North West• A pre-existing access point onto the A61.• Very clearly defined boundaries with the A61 to the east and elsewhere surrounded by woodland.• Contained within strongly defensible boundaries toprevent urban sprawl.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

please see q H6

Question Ref: H8

• Two sites currently classified as red should be re-classified as amber (site 2051B and site 2054).• See question H6.

North Comments

Name: Cathy Theaker

Representor No: PRS04477 **Representation ID:** REP01439

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

THE AMOUNT OF HOUSES SUGGESTED FOR OTLEY (1,177 OUT OF 2,000) IS COMPLETELY EXCESSIVE FOR THIS HISTORIC MARKET TOWN AND WOULD MASSIVELY DEPRECIATE THE CHARACTER OF THE TOWN INTO SUBURBIA. WE ALREADY HAVE A LARGE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT UNDERWAY AT GARNETTS MILL, VERY CLOSE TO THE PROPOSED AREA.THE PROPOSED INCREASE IN DEVELOPMENT WOULD SEVERELY IMPACT ON THE TOWN'S RESOURCES. WE HAVE NO TRAIN STATION AND LIMITED BUS SERVICES, MEANING NEW RESIDENTS WOULD HAVE TO DRIVE TO WORK IN LEEDS, BRADFORD OR HARROGATE, INCREASING TRAFFIC AND POLLUTION IN OTLEY AND SURROUNDING AREAS ON ROUTE.WE DO NOT HAVE SPACE TO ACCOMMODATE THOUSANDS MORE CARS DRIVING IN TO OTLEY TO GET THEIR SHOPPING. SCHOOLS, GP SURGERIES AND DENTISTS DO NOT HAVE CAPACITY FOR SUCH LARGE NUMBERS OF NEW RESIDENTS.

Question Ref: H2

SITE 745 (EAST OF OTLEY)SITE DETAILS CARRIED FORWARD FROM THE UDP HAVE NOT BEEN PUBLISHED IN THE LDF SCHEDULE OF SITES.ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN THE UDP HEARING EG. RELIEF ROAD AND TRAFFIC ETC. HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED.NO PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE IN ADDRESSING THESE PROBLEMS.ONE REQUIREMENT IS TO HAVE AN AGREED PLANNING FRAMEWORK IN PLACE AND SUBJECT TO PUBLIC CONSULTATION.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H6

TWO SITES IN THE LEEDS NORTH AREA CLASSIFIED AS RED SHOULD BE RECLASSIFIED AS AMBER:SITE 2051B (SOUTH WEST OF ECCUP RESERVOIR)- VERY LARGE SITE NEAR SITE 2051A LOCATED CLOSE TO LEEDS CITY CENTRE, THEREFORE HAVING MANY TRANSPORT ROUTES TO LEEDS. IT IS CONTAINED WITH BOUNDARIES PREVENTING URBAN SPRAWLSITE 2054 (SOUTH EAST OF ECCUP RESERVOIR)LARGE SITE NEAR SITE 2053B CLASSIFIED AMBER. LOCATED NEAR LEEDS CITY CENTRE SO MUCH BETTER ACCESS THAN OTHER PROPOSED SITES. PRE-EXISTING ACCESS POINT ONTO A61. CLEAR BOUNDARIES AGAIN

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

SEE QUESTION H6

Question Ref: H8

TWO SITES CURRENTLY CLASSIFIED RED SHOULD BE CLASSIFIED AMBER (SITE 2051B AND SITE 2054)SEE QUESTION H6

North Comments

Name: Zoe Thomas

Representor No: PRS02191 **Representation ID:** REP04422

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. There are plenty of houses already in cookridge. There are many other brown sites where houses could be built which have more facilities to service more houses. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. The roads are already crowded and more traffic will increase the likelihood of accidents and damage to the roads. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The schools in Coorkdge and nearby Horsforth are already over subscribed. We cannot cope with more pressure on these services, or others such as doctorsetc, there are also no extra childrend's facilities like play areas etc. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. We are near to water supplies and they already flood when it rains. This will increase if Moseley wood is developed. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. We regularly walk in this area and the wildlife is clear to see. This should not be disrupted.

North Comments

Name: Allan Thomas

Representor No: PRS05630 **Representation ID:** REP06290

Question Ref: H7

I agree with the council officers decision that the above two sites should be " sites NOT considered suitable for housing".

North Comments

Name: Beryl Thompson

Representor No: PRS02833 **Representation ID:** REP05385

Question Ref: H4

This land should not be used for any type of building. Adel church is a grade 1 listed building and all approaches should be left as greenfield sites. It is visited by people from all over the world and should be given its own space

Question Ref: H7

I feel these sites should not be built on due to its proximity to Adel church

North Comments

Name: Sarah Thompson

Representor No: PRS05351 **Representation ID:** REP05949

Question Ref: H4

After receiving a leaflet regarding the plans for a new housing development near to where I live, I felt the need to air my objections to the proposed development. The area in question just does not have the accessibility for the amount of houses planned. The amount of passing traffic this would create is ridiculous when you consider most families now have two cars. The street I live on is next door to the site and it is already busy especially due to people using it as a short cut to get to the main roundabout on the A65 and also due to the fact that Newlaithes School is at the bottom. I feel the area around the school could become extremely congested, putting the safety of the children at risk. A further concern is the increase in traffic on the A65. The main Horsforth roundabout is already chaos at peak times and this is set to get worse due to the massive development on the old Sandos site.

Local services are already being stretched. It's difficult to get an appointment with your GP and local children are being refused entry to their local schools. The people that are more than likely to buy these houses will be families with young children or couples planning a family as it is a desired place to live, but there is just not the school places available.

Besides all of the above, the area that is been considered is a walking and playing area for the community. I think the proposed plans will have an extremely detrimental affect on this neighbourhood and strongly object to this going ahead.

North Comments

Name: David Thompson

Representor No: PRS05437 **Representation ID:** REP06062

Question Ref: H4

I wish to strongly disagree to build properties on Site 1202. The considered site has been a green space for as long as one can remember . It is a safe place where children can play, one day last week there were three different cricket games going on at the same time. It is a lovely green lung' opposite Newlaithes School. Their are all to few of these areas in Horsforth , and therefore be cherished .

North Comments

Name: David Thompson

Representor No: PRS05437 **Representation ID:** REP06370

Question Ref: H4

I wish to strongly disagree to build properties on Site 1202. The considered site has been a green space for as long as one can remember . It is a safe place where children can play, one day last week there were three different cricket games going on at the same time. It is a lovely green lung' opposite Newlaithes School. Their are all to few of these areas in Horsforth , and therefore be cherished .

North Comments

Name: G Thornley

Representor No: PRS06107 Representation ID: REP06971

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree.

The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem. Strongly agree. Moved here as it is a quiet road and bring up my family. More traffic will be a lot unsafer for children to cross.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Main school would be Cookridge Holy Trinity. This school is already packed. There is no room to build extra classrooms on this ground and I think children's education would suffer!

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More bbuilding WILL affect this. Strong agree. Live at top of Cookridge Drive and our back garden floods. Building these houses at the bottom of the hill will severely flood.

Moseley Bottom is a important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Wildlife should not suffer due to unnecessary building of a new housing estate!

North Comments

Name: Christine Thornton

Representor No: PRS01875 **Representation ID:** REP04048

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. Would spoil woodlands and countryside. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. The roads in Cookridge are congested enough. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Too goggy for building on. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. I love living adjacent to this bit of woodland.

North Comments

Name: Harriet Thornton

Representor No: PRS03095 **Representation ID:** REP01601

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H2

I disagree with the any development at the moseley wood gardens site, which is site reference 1199. The reasons are as follows: 1. ROADWAYS - I live on moseley wood gardens so have first hand knowledge of the traffic in the area. The access would I understand be down moseley wood gardens which does not have the capacity to take any additional cars as it is already difficult to drive on with. This is because the drives are not wide or long enough to take two cars and therefore the residents have to park on the road. any additional cars on this road would increase traffic and likely to increase the chances of accidents, particularly on the bend. This area always suffers badly in the winter and it would not take any additional traffic. With 200 houses you are looking at at least 400 cars and this is just not feasible on such a narrow estate road which was clearly not designed or built to carry anything over than what it currently serves. 2. SCHOOLS - There are only two primary schools in this area which are already at capacity and do not have the facility to take any additional children. There seems to be no provision to address this issue and it would be incorrect for current residents not to have the ability to take their children to the local school. There does not seem to be any area around the school which could be used to extend the schools. 3. Wildlife - this area is home to a variety of wildlife and it is important to maintain green space and these habitats. I have newts in my pond and we regularly see red kites and other wildlife. I believe we have an important role to play in protecting the green spaces for future generations and have an obligation to protect these animals habitats. 4. Rights of way - residents have since the moseley wood estate was built walked through the fields and therefore believe they have prescriptive rights of way over the fields. There are numerous residents who have been here for numerous years who would be able to provide the necessary statutory declarations in support of their right should these right be impeded. It was clearly thought of that residents would use the field as their is access to it from the estate. 5. Housing need - it is quite clear from simply looking around the area that there are number of houses available and on the market that are not selling. There is also a new development at the old cookridge hospital so this area is at capacity. That compounded with the number of empty properties in leeds clearly shows that there is no need for any new houses. Surely, we cannot just build houses to try and generate jobs there must be an actual housing need. These are my key reasons for objecting. I am also very disappointed that the council's earlier development plan said that there would be no consideration for development until 2017 and this seems to have been suddenly disregarded.

Question Ref: H3

I think if development must be carried out in cook ridge, although I do not this is required or necessary the only site that would be suitable would be the cookridge golf club because the access is off a main road and there is sufficient land to be able to build supporting services such as a school which is what is needed provided it did not interfere with the nature reserve behind it

Question Ref: H4

y

Question Ref: H5

Land at Mosely Wood Gardens - site 1199. Please refer the points stated earlier

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H9

Site 1199 should be red as it is clearly not suitable for housing development as per my reasons stated above. The cookridge hospital site is a lot more suitable

Question Ref: H11

No

Question Ref: H12

No

Question Ref: H13

No

Question Ref: H14

No

Question Ref: H15

Not known

Question Ref: General comment

I would like to know how the council can issue a development plan and confirm that land will not be considered until 2017 and then completely ignore such policy.

North Comments

Name: Chris Thornton

Representor No: PRS03226 **Representation ID:** REP00025

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

The local infrastructure can not cope with an influx of new housing and associated people. In addition local flooding issues are of a major concern, we need green fields to allow absorbency of rain water.

Question Ref: H2

1199 Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge. Due to the worrying and potential flooding of the railway line. Complete lack of infrastructure i.e. schools both primary and secondary. Schools are considerably over subscribed as it is.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H10

Consideration should be given to using brown field sites for housing.

Question Ref: General comment

The future is in your hands, do not ruin it for the next generation.

North Comments

Name: Chris Thornton

Representor No: PRS03226 **Representation ID:** REP01847

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Poor infrastructure i.e. roads, schools and public transport. In addition, the potential destruction of green space and wildlife.

Question Ref: H2

I strongly disagree with the site at Moseley Wood bottom site code: 1199 due to the lack of infrastructure, the roads and congested now, there is no provision for extra residence in terms of schooling and public transport. Given that houses are on the market within this area and struggling to sell I would suggest that there is no need for any other houses. Also there is considerable wildlife residing in the proposed green land i.e. deers, rabbits, Red kites, Newts. Given, the government wants to build houses and we need to spread the build I would suggest that houses should be built on sites 3044 and 3360 these would provide better access to main roads and would have the provision to build additional schools on the site given its size.

Question Ref: H3

Sites 3044 and 3360. better access to main road and could accommodate a new school given their size.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

Site 1199, see previous reason

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H8

see previous reasons and site references

Question Ref: H10

Brown field sites, houses that are empty etc. re-development should always be considered prior to new development.

Question Ref: H12

NO

Question Ref: H13

No

Question Ref: H14

No, locally there is more than enough elderly housing.

Question Ref: H15

No

Question Ref: General comment

Please for the next generation do not take away their green spaces, you have a responsibility and power that can stop this. Building new homes is not the answer, what is is re-development. The area in question is a breaking point in terms of schooling and infrastructure don't break it. Do we want to live in a world where profit wins and green spaces are taken away with wildlife becoming less evident.

North Comments

Name: Helen Thornton

Representor No: PRS04625 **Representation ID:** REP00813

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

The Plan proposes that 1177 of the 2000 houses required for this area are to be located in Otley. This would bring a massive increase to the Otley population and would stretch local resources to breaking. (The schools are already full, and the Doctors surgeries would struggle to provide adequate care). Given the poor employment prospects in Otley these new residents will be working in Leeds and will add to the extreme traffic congestion heading in and out of Leeds at rush hour. Surely it would make more sense to locate the houses closer to Leeds?

Question Ref: H2

Site 745 (East of Otley) No reference is made to the importance (identified by the UDP hearing) of ensuring that traffic only enters the new housing on the new relief road and not down East Busk Lane which is a tiny country lane with poor access on to the Pool Road. No reference is made to having an agreed planning framework in place with public consultation.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H6

1. Site 205B (SW of Eccup Reservoir) This site is much closer to Leeds where almost all the new residents will be working and has much better transport links than Otley. Close to Amber site 2051. It is a very large site which will make it attractive to a developer as will the fact that no Relief Road will have to be built. There are clearly defined boundaries (roads, golf course woodland, existing housing).
2. Site 2054 (SE of Eccup Reservoir) Close to Leeds with better transport links. Adjacent to Amber site 2053B. Pre existing access to the A61 which provides a clear boundary, with woodland providing other boundaries.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

See previous answer.

Question Ref: H8

Sites 2051B and 2054 currently classified as red should be amber.

Question Ref: H9

See above H6

North Comments

Name: Stanley Thorpe

Representor No: PRS04824 Representation ID: REP01561

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I can understand most of the reasons put forward for the use of the green sites. These involve quite a lot of green belt, but in my opinion they are closer to Leeds and as such would not add to the traffic congestion until we get further down the A65.

Question Ref: H3

2038 is coded amber, but is Brownfield. The fact that it would require remedial works before a residential use could be considered should not make so much difference. Surely the profit margins of the builders aren't the issue here. Brownfield should be considered before any scrap of greenbelt is used. After all Brownfield has already been developed, but once built on you will never get green belt back.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: H6

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H8

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H9

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

North Comments

Name: Stanley Thorpe

Representor No: PRS04824 **Representation ID:** REP01561

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area. I have submitted them as my own, as I agree with them entirely. [x]

North Comments

Name: Andrew And Vicky Thorpe

Representor No: PRS05468 Representation ID: REP06096

Question Ref: H7

The land surrounding Hunger Hills woods should be granted as unsuitable for development. Being a Horsforth resident this area should be considered as important for local tree , flower and wildlife conservation. It offers some of the most pleasurable walks and views over Leeds . The water run off is also important and is the source of several streams running down the valley to the Aire and any building work would ruin the natural infrastructure.

We are strongly in support of this being kept as unsuitable for redevelopment and should be considered as part of Leeds heritage and its Golden Halo of wonderful open spaces.

North Comments

Name: D. M & Muriel Thorp

Representor No: PRS00362 **Representation ID:** REP02306

Question Ref: H7

1015 - Hunger Hills and land south of Lee Lane West is not considered suitable for allocation of housing. We totally agree with the above statement.

North Comments

Name: Valerie Thurston

Representor No: PRS05594 **Representation ID:** REP06251

Question Ref: H7

With regard to Site Number 1015 Hunger Hills housing development, I would like to agree with the classification of this site, that it is not suitable for the allocation of housing due to the following reasons:

Natural woodland, there are numerous sites within the city that are brown field sites without the destruction of natural woodland on the fringes of the suburbs, impacting the local environment.

There would be an impact on West End Lane Primary School places.

Not enough parking facilities in the West End Lane area to cope with an increase of pupils and traffic, leading to safety issues.

The road infrastructure in the area would not be able to cope with additional housing. Nearby sites (Clariant and Kirkstall Forge) have already been granted planning permission to build houses. This in itself will have a massive impact on the A65/Ring road, especially around peak times, any further developments would add significantly to this problem.

There would be potential public transport issues.

North Comments

Name: Clifford Thurston

Representor No: PRS05597 **Representation ID:** REP06255

Question Ref: H7

With regard to Site Number 1015 Hunger Hills housing development, I would like to agree with the classification of this site, that it is not suitable for the allocation of housing due to the following reasons:

Natural woodland, there are numerous sites within the city that are brown field sites without the destruction of natural woodland on the fringes of the suburbs, impacting the local environment.

There would be an impact on West End Lane Primary School places.

Not enough parking facilities in the West End Lane area to cope with an increase of pupils and traffic, leading to safety issues.

The road infrastructure in the area would not be able to cope with additional housing. Nearby sites (Clariant and Kirkstall Forge) have already been granted planning permission to build houses. This in itself will have a massive impact on the A65/Ring road, especially around peak times, any further developments would add significantly to this problem.

There would be potential public transport issues.

North Comments

Name: Hayley Thurston

Representor No: PRS05610 **Representation ID:** REP06267

Question Ref: H7

With regard to Site Number 1015 Hunger Hills housing development, I would like to agree with the classification of this site, that it is not suitable for the allocation of housing due to the following reasons:

Natural woodland, there are numerous sites within the city that are brown field sites without the destruction of natural woodland on the fringes of the suburbs, impacting the local environment.

There would be an impact on West End Lane Primary School places.

Not enough parking facilities in the West End Lane area to cope with an increase of pupils and traffic, leading to safety issues.

The road infrastructure in the area would not be able to cope with additional housing. Nearby sites (Clariant and Kirkstall Forge) have already been granted planning permission to build houses. This in itself will have a massive impact on the A65/Ring road, especially around peak times, any further developments would add significantly to this problem.

There would be potential public transport issues.

North Comments

Name: Margaret Tiernan

Representor No: PRS00699 **Representation ID:** REP02698

Question Ref: H4

1095B – I do not agree to this land being built on. Pool is a small village, has a poor facilities / shops and the road network is very squashed on a good day. Old Pool Bank has suffered a land slide in recent years and the added volume of traffic will cause greater stress on the land. Green belt land needs protecting. Ruining the iconic landmark of Pool village from Leeds Road is terrible. Whilst I understand each area needs to 'open up' areas to build new houses, site 1095B is not one of them. Sites 2054 and 2053A at Alwoodley and Eccup needs to be changed from red to green as the roads are more substantial and they fit better with existing houses. 1095B also floods.

Question Ref: H4

1369 – I do not agree to all of this land being built on. I appreciate the government has to increase land space for new homes and as a compromise, would agree to 1 section of this land to be built on. The drawing shows this [see scanned sheet – respondent indicating northern half with access from the north].

There are no shops, schools are full and no doctors surgery. Site 1369 also floods.

Question Ref: H4

2053B – these are currently 'red'. In my opinion these sites need altering, from red to either amber (2053A) or green (2054) as the infrastructure is much better suited than Pool. The roads are better suited. There's a greater selection of schools, shops and doctors surgeries as it's nearer to the city than Pool is. I agree site 2051A should remain red and believe my views listed above are sensible and well thought through. 2053B is currently amber. This should be green as per above notes.

Question Ref: H7

2054 & 2053A – these are currently 'red'. In my opinion these sites need altering, from red to either amber (2053A) or green (2054) as the infrastructure is much better suited than Pool. The roads are better suited. There's a greater selection of schools, shops and doctors surgeries as it's nearer to the city than Pool is. I agree site 2051A should remain red and believe my views listed above are sensible and well thought through. 2053B is currently amber. This should be green as per above notes.

North Comments

Name: Jean A Tiffany

Representor No: PRS01543 **Representation ID:** REP03684

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Strongly agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: J R Tiffin

Representor No: PRS02181 **Representation ID:** REP04411

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Tiffin

Representor No: PRS02182 **Representation ID:** REP04412

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Further development would have an impact on all the elderly people who have retired into Cookridge for a quiet life. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. A lot of Cookridge is made up of minor roads and would not be able to cope with more traffic. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Regarding the health centre that we personally visit it is already difficult to obtain appointments. This would not be helped by an increase in population. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. We ourselves have not been affected by flooding but not the political is there when it could impact on obtaining house insurance in the future. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. It would be a shame to lose this.

North Comments

Name: Judy & Peter Till

Representor No: PRS00820 Representation ID: REP02834

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

Public Transport will be disrupted.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Maureen Timm

Representor No: PRS05995 **Representation ID:** REP06814

Question Ref: H7

We wish to register our agreement with The Council, to classify the above site as,
UNSUITABLE FOR HOUSING

North Comments

Name: Charles Tindall

Representor No: PRS00067 **Representation ID:** REP00473

Question Ref: H4

2053B - All these sites at Alwoodley and Eccup seem to be a much better proposal. More homes can be built. The road infrastructure is much better. Public transport is better being on a main route from Harrogate to Leeds.

Question Ref: H7

2051A / 2053A - All these sites at Alwoodley and Eccup seem to be a much better proposal. More homes can be built. The road infrastructure is much better. Public transport is better being on a main route from Harrogate to Leeds.

Question Ref: H7

1095B / 1095C / 1095D / 1369 - Traffic management will be the biggest problem for these sites if houses are built on. They will also prevent Pool from ever having a by pass to alleviate these traffic problems.

Question Ref: H7

1095A - Traffic management will be the biggest problem for these sites if houses are built on. They will also prevent Pool from ever having a by pass to alleviate these traffic problems.

North Comments

Name: Jamie Tinsley

Representor No: PRS03349 Representation ID: REP00066

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H4

y

Question Ref: H4

BUT ONLY YES if they are empty houses being re-developed or brown field sites..

Question Ref: H5

Sites that are green - but again if brown field or empty homes being re-developed..

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Site ref 3044 and 3360 is colour coded RED and as such should be left as GREEN BELT - As a local resident I am appalled that these areas are even being considered due the natural landscape and beauty of the area.. Not to mention the natural woodland and wildlife that resides in these areas.. Lots of empty homes in Leeds could be re-developed and many brown field sites do exist - so these should be the priority.. The Council has many powers given to it by the Government to action re-development of empty housing and building on brown field site - so that should be your focus ALWAYS..

Question Ref: H10

Lots of empty homes in Leeds could be re-developed and many brown field sites do exist - so these should be the priority.. The Council has many powers given to it by the Government to action re-development of empty housing and building on brown field site - so that should be your focus ALWAYS..

Question Ref: H13

Lots of empty homes in Leeds could be re-developed and many brown field sites do exist - so these should be the priority.. The Council has many powers given to it by the Government to action re-development of empty housing and building on brown field site - so that should be your focus ALWAYS..

Question Ref: H14

Lots of empty homes in Leeds could be re-developed and many brown field sites do exist - so these should be the priority.. The Council has many powers given to it by the Government to action re-development of empty housing and building on brown field site - so that should be your focus ALWAYS..

North Comments

Name: Jason Todhunter

Representor No: PRS03517 Representation ID: REP01510

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Planning permission has previously been denied for site 118 the view Alwoodley. The two properties which are proposed to be redeveloped both independently applied for planning previously and both of these applications were also dismissed. What has changed to alter these decisions.

Question Ref: H2

Site 118 planning application P/08/04145/FU dated 9 July 2008 was refused by notice dated 3 September 2008. A judgement carried out by the inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for communities and local government upheld the decision to deny planning permission on 18th March 2009. The main issues identified in the judgement were The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties, with particular regard to any overbearing effects or any impact on overlooking and privacy. A further 5 reasons were detailed in the judgement.

Question Ref: H3

No

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

North Comments

Name: M Tojagic

Representor No: PRS05349 Representation ID: REP05941

Question Ref: H7

5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 This representation is on behalf of the landowner of SHLAA site 1019, land off Gledhow Valley Road, Chapel Allerton, Leeds.

5.2 The landowner confirms that this site is available now for new housing development.

5.3 This representation argues that this site provides the greatest potential for a housing land allocation in this location, in the emerging Site Allocations Plan for the reasons given in this statement and as summarised below. Therefore, the current 'red' status of the site's housing potential should be amended to 'green'.

5.4 Furthermore, the landowners agree with the City Council's proposed amendment to the greenspace allocation to reflect the fact that the site is not and never has been in allotment or any other greenspace use.

5.5 The Leeds Core Strategy, plans up to 2028 and seeks to give local communities within the settlement hierarchy the opportunity to provide for some growth at an appropriate scale and impact. The site is located within the Main Urban Area, in a highly sustainable location where land allocations will be made to provide for some 33,300 new dwellings up to 2028.

5.6 For the avoidance of doubt the information contained within this representation provides the following answers to the relevant consultation questions set by the Council;

- 'H1: Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'green' represent the most suitable sites to consider allocating for future housing development?' Answer: NO – The subject site, land off Gledhow Valley Road, Chapel Allerton, Leeds, SHLAA site 1019 represents one of the most suitable sites to consider allocating for future housing development.
- 'H2: Which sites do you disagree with and why?'. Answer: SHLAA site 1019 is a suitable site for housing allocation for reasons stated.
- 'Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been?'. Answer: YES. SHLAA site 1019 should have been coded green.
- 'H7. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'red' are not suitable for allocation for future housing development?' Answer: NO. It is considered that SHLAA site 1019 is suitable for housing allocation for the reasons given in this statement.
- 'H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why?'. Answer: SHLAA site 1019 should not be identified as red for the reasons stated.

Full submission saved under REP05941

North Comments

Name: M Tojagic

Representor No: PRS05349 **Representation ID:** REP05958

Question Ref: G10

Allotments off Gledhow Valley Road, Chapel Allerton

4.0 WHY THE REMOVAL OF THE PREVIOUS ALLOCATION OF PART OF SHLAA SITE 1019 AS ALLOTMENTS, SHOULD BE SUPPORTED.

4.1 This representation supports the proposal at G10 of Leeds Site Allocations Plan, Volume 2-- - 5 North. This states;

"G10 – Part of the existing UDP N1A (allotments) designation at land off Gledhow Valley Road Chapel Allerton has been put forward as a possible housing site (site ref. 1019). It was not identified as in a greenspace use in the Open Space Audit therefore it is proposed to amend the boundary of the allocation to exclude this land. Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace...or released for housing?"

4.2 The representation site is in private ownership with no public access to it and has never been in use as allotments or any other greenspace use.

4.3 The submitters have consistently advised the local planning authority that the existing UDPR designation was erroneous. The allotments are further north along Gledhow Valley Road close to its junction with Harrogate Road. As no part of the representation site has been used as allotments, this is assumed to be a drafting error to be properly corrected as part of the preparation of the LDF.

4.4 Therefore site should not be allocated as greenspace or allotments. Accordingly, the submitters agree with the proposal to amend the boundary of the greenspace allocation to exclude the site. The site clearly fails the criteria for greenspace allocation as set out in the RUDP and specifically, as no part of the site has ever been in allotment use or serves a greenspace function, it is requested that this designation is removed as part of the production of the forthcoming Site Allocations Plan.

Full submission is saved under REP05958 with more details on housing comments

North Comments

Name: Monica Tomkiss

Representor No: PRS05746 **Representation ID:** REP06417

Question Ref: H7

As part of the consultation process,I am writing to support the Council's decision to designate the above site (Hunger Hills and land to the south of Lee Lane West in Horsforth) as unsuitable for housing..

North Comments

Name: William Tomkiss

Representor No: PRS06233 **Representation ID:** REP07140

Question Ref: H7

I am writing to let you know that I agree with the Council's classification of the above site in Hunger Hills and off Lee Lane West in Horsforth as not suitable for housing.

North Comments

Name: Monica Tomkss

Representor No: PRS05876 **Representation ID:** REP06621

Question Ref: H7

As part of the consultation process,I am writing to support the Council's decision to designate the above site (Hunger Hills and land to the south of Lee Lane West in Horsforth) as unsuitable for housing..

North Comments

Name: Rachael Tomlinson

Representor No: PRS02296 Representation ID: REP04539

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Rachael Tomlinson

Representor No: PRS02296 Representation ID: REP04539

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Rachael Tomlinson

Representor No: PRS02296 **Representation ID:** REP04539

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Rachael Tomlinson

Representor No: PRS02296 Representation ID: REP04539

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Rachael Tomlinson

Representor No: PRS02296 Representation ID: REP04539

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in not way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: Rachael Tomlinson

Representor No: PRS02296 **Representation ID:** REP04539

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 — LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: General comment

We would also like to add that Adel has a village feel yet is close to a major city. This is unique and something the residents cherish. If the planned number of dwellings are built this would inevitably be lost.

North Comments

Name: Gillian Tones

Representor No: PRS02511 **Representation ID:** REP04787

Question Ref: H1

1199 Land of Moseley Wood Gardens Green to Red.

This site should be changed from green to red, as it is totally unsuitable for building more homes in Cookridge. The area already has an excess of traffic & Moseley Wood lane will be used as a cutthrough by more vehicles. There are many times when this road is almost blocked by parked vehicles & large lorries taking a short cut to Tesco's.

There are not sufficient school places already and a further 200 homes would make it totally unacceptable the facilities in this area are not suitable to accommodate further families.

North Comments

Name: Kate Toplass

Representor No: PRS01064 Representation ID: REP03129

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Simon Toplass

Representor No: PRS01065 Representation ID: REP03132

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Brenda Torry

Representor No: PRS04259 Representation ID: REP00615

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

They appear to complement existing areas of housing, and to my knowledge do not pose a problem (in terms of causing flooding, etc) to existing households.

Question Ref: H2

Site 3026 should be considered unsuitable for housing. Throughout the winter a large proportion of this field is a flood plane. The houses on Moorland Crescent would likely flood if you built on this field. Happy to send you pictures / video clips of this.

Question Ref: H3

I don't know the other sites well enough to comment on this.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Site 3026 is a flood plane throughout the winter months. This should be designated not suitable.

Question Ref: H5

Site 3026 is a flood plane throughout the winter months. This should be designated not suitable.

Question Ref: H6

Unfamiliar with some of these sites.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

I am unable to see why sites 3028, 3029, 1255, 1256, 3326 or 3034 are considered not suitable. I accept I do not know these sites well, but from what I can see they do not appear to pose any threat to existing housing (in terms of flooding, etc).

Question Ref: H9

site 3026 (because it is a flood plane throughout the winter).

North Comments

Name: Richard Towers

Representor No: PRS03711 Representation ID: REP00158

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H2

With regard to site 1199 in Cookridge.1/ Access to the site is very limited and would be through an existing residential area which is already over loaded with cars. Most households in Cookridge are 2 car owners and use them on a daily basis.2/ Cookridge has limited acces with only 1 road to the south west over a railway bridge which is already grid locked at peak periods.3/ The site is a natural flod plan and acts as a sponge. Run off water runs into Mossley Wood beck which is a flash flood stream and can rise rapidly. Any additional run off of water would cause additional flooding further doen stream. Flooding of the Leeds Harrogate railway line would be at a much higher increased risk. The proposed development on the current site would cause fast run off of water and even with flood elevation on site significant additional volume of water would run off rather than acting as a sponge.4./ Current schools in the area are full with out space to grow.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

With regard to site 1199 in Cookridge.1/ Access to the site is very limited and would be through an existing residential area which is already over loaded with cars. Most households in Cookridge are 2 car owners and use them on a daily basis.2/ Cookridge has limited acces with only 1 road to the south west over a railway bridge which is already grid locked at peak periods.3/ The site is a natural flod plan and acts as a sponge. Run off water runs into Mossley Wood beck which is a flash flood stream and can rise rapidly. Any additional run off of water would cause additional flooding further doen stream. Flooding of the Leeds Harrogate railway line would be at a much higher increased risk. The proposed development on the current site would cause fast run off of water and even with flood elevation on site significant additional volume of water would run off rather than acting as a sponge.4./ Current schools in the area are full with out space to grow.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H9

With regard to site 1199 in Cookridge.1/ Access to the site is very limited and would be through an existing residential area which is already over loaded with cars. Most households in Cookridge are 2 car owners and use them on a daily basis.2/ Cookridge has limited acces with only 1 road to the south west over a railway bridge which is already grid locked at peak periods.3/ The site is a natural flod plan and acts as a sponge. Run off water runs into Mossley Wood beck which is a flash flood stream and can rise rapidly. Any additional run off of water would cause additional flooding further doen stream. Flooding of the Leeds Harrogate railway line would be at a much higher increased risk. The proposed development on the current site would cause fast run off of water and even with flood elevation on site significant additional volume of water would run off rather than acting as a sponge.4./ Current schools in the area are full with out space to grow.

North Comments

Name: Stephen Towler

Representor No: PRS03790 **Representation ID:** REP01956

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

I support the building of houses on 'brown field' sites. I do not agree with the building of houses on 'green field' sites, especially where there are additional issues.

Question Ref: H2

I particularly object to site reference 1199. The building of homes on this site would have several detrimental effects, which include:- development on this site would generate a substantial increase in car activity, which the roads in the area could not cope with. I believe it is not possible to make sufficient change to the road system to compensate;- development of family housing would create a significant problem in providing local school places, especially in primary schools, and other local services, such as GP services would be put under extreme pressure.

Question Ref: H3

No

Question Ref: H4

y

Question Ref: H7

y

North Comments

Name: Eve Townsley

Representor No: PRS01929 **Representation ID:** REP04110

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. Lack of amenities already. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Green Lane is already dangerous. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. We have 2 young children so are concerned about this. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. This is really important for young families.

North Comments

Name: Robert Trainor

Representor No: PRS04467 Representation ID: REP00894

Question Ref: G1

I am totally opposed to the reduction of greenspace in the Bramhope area.

Question Ref: G2

n

Question Ref: G3

n

Question Ref: G4

y

Question Ref: G5

n

Question Ref: G6

n

Question Ref: G7

The green belt is precious and will be lost forever. Development of brown space within the ring road should be the priority regardless of Housing developer profit. Bramhope in particular must not be allowed to increase housing stock by 30% it does not have the infrastructure or transport service to accomodate the build and new residents.

Question Ref: CCG1

n

Question Ref: CCG2

n

Question Ref: G9

0

Question Ref: G10

0

Question Ref: G8

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G9

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G9

Golf club is precious resource for the area. Any sale of golf course for housing would be totally opposed.

North Comments

Name: Jonathan Tripp

Representor No: PRS03921 Representation ID: REP00389

Question Ref: G1

GreenSpace should not be compromised or reduced.

Question Ref: G2

n

Question Ref: G2

Greenspace is a legacy for our children and community that the present council does not have the moral or ethical right to reduce for ever by its actions. Certainly Brown sites and old Quarries, and failing shop parades should be considered.

Question Ref: G3

n

Question Ref: G4

y

Question Ref: G4

This will benefit the environment which directly impacts upon people and the communities mental and physical health.

Question Ref: G5

n

Question Ref: G5

A yes vote to this would be misused by unsuitable councillors.

Question Ref: G6

y

Question Ref: G6

For reasons that you imply.

Question Ref: G7

Tinshill school is dilapidated and cut off from the community. Its green areas should be opened up. Or it should be demolished along with the Bedford Pub and the Garages behind Silk Mill Drive shops and used for decent-interesting-low cost housing. Council Estates need re-generation via mixed housing with private development.

Question Ref: CCG1

n

Question Ref: CCG2

n

Question Ref: G9

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G13

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G15

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G16

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G9

0

North Comments

Name: Jonathan Tripp

Representor No: PRS03921 **Representation ID:** REP00389

Question Ref: G10
0

North Comments

Name: Michael Trousdale

Representor No: PRS00101 **Representation ID:** REP00507

Question Ref: H4

1202 - In my opinion this site is totally unsuitable for development as the access is so very limited through the already approved site (731). Surely no access would be granted at the south end of the site via Newlathes School access road. Also the Horsforth schools are already oversubscribed. Another reason to oppose this scheme is the increase in traffic burden that will be imposed on the already impossibly loaded A65 / Broadway roundabout. The entire A65 corridor is under ridiculous strain during 'rush hours' and a further 200 homes with the traffic associated is to be avoided.

North Comments

Name: Mick Trousdale

Representor No: PRS05319 Representation ID: REP05917

Question Ref: H4

This mail is voice my opposition to the proposed development site 1202.

I am directly affected by this proposed development as i live at [x].

In my opinion this site is totally unsuitable for development as the access will be so very limited through the already approved site No731. Surely no access would be granted via the Newlalthes School access road at the southern end of the site?

Also the schools in horsforth are already over subscribed i believe. There is already a large problem with traffic / parking around Newlalthes School at school start and finish times

A further reason to oppose this scheme is the increase in traffic burden that would be imposed on the already impossibly loaded A65 / Broadway roundabout. The entire A65 corridor is under ridiculous strain during the busy periods and a further 200 homes with the cars associated with them really should be avoided at all costs.

North Comments

Name: Trevor Trout

Representor No: PRS00493 **Representation ID:** REP02441

Question Ref: G17

2055 – To use this green belt land will cause many problems. On the allotment the wildlife is very active and we are asked to encourage wildlife. Also my main concern is people like myself will lose a great deal. We are mostly elderly people who work together producing pure home grown food. Also, the place is where we can feel at peace in this very disruptive land.

North Comments

Name: Jennifer Tulip

Representor No: PRS05585 **Representation ID:** REP06238

Question Ref: H1

'KEEP CALM AND OBJECT'

You may be aware of plans to build some 200 houses in Moseley Bottom: the green pasture fields close to the beck and rail line (site ref: 1199).

This work if approved will take more than 6 years. That is 6 years of heavy traffic, noise and disruption in your neighbourhood.

Traffic will considerably increase with new houses, adding hundreds of cars using all of the area for rat runs. This affects everyone, not just those near to the fields, so have your say NOW!

Please take a few moments to complete your answers to the questions below. Remember, this is for you and for all of us who enjoy living in Cookridge.

Your name [x]

Address [x]

Postcode [x]

Email [x]

Phone...[x]

Please tick the following answer which is nearest to your view and add comments you feel are important.

Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments

Strongly agree Agree Unsure Disagree Strongly disagree

Your comments Development should not occur on greenfield sites. More is needed to be done to protect greenfield sites like this for the good of biodiversity. There are plenty of derelict homes that can be restored so the lack of housing should not be used as an excuse to build on greenfield sites.

The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem

Strongly agree Agree Unsure Disagree Strongly disagree

()()Y()()

Your comments This may be an issue but it is not my main concern

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand

Strongly agree Agree Unsure Disagree Strongly disagree

()()Y()()

Your comments I have seen no evidence to support either belief

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this

Strongly agree Agree Unsure Disagree Strongly disagree

()Y()()

Your comments reducing the area of land for infiltration of water causes flooding- more buildings will reduce the infiltration in the area

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat

Strongly agree Agree Unsure Disagree Strongly disagree

()Y()()

Your comments All greenfield sites benefit wildlife more than developments do

North Comments

Name: Christine Turgoose

Representor No: PRS00930 **Representation ID:** REP02965

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

Cookridge does not have the necessary infra-structure to cope with further development.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

Would result in increased hazards to pedestrians and creation of rat-runs.

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

Even as things stand, local schools and many local services are over-subscribed.

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

Repeated flooding over many years will be exacerbated by further development.

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

Important to retain at a time when so much land is being lost to development.

North Comments

Name: John Turner

Representor No: PRS00770 **Representation ID:** REP02758

Question Ref: H4

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments

Strongly agree

Existing infrastructure including schools, road, shops, trains, buses, recreational (no playing fields or parks) is already overloaded.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem

Strongly agree

The bridge at Horsforth station is already a severe bottleneck.Parking facilities at the station and adjacent roads are already totally inadequate with only one access into the proposed development, all the local roads will become rat-runs.

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand

Strongly agree

All primary schools in the area are already oversubscribed. There are already insufficient dentists in the area. Local surgeries are already at capacity.

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this

Strongly agree

Part of the site is within the flood plain of Mosely Beck. Any flood protection to allow development will increase flood risk elsewhere, particularly to the railway line. Building in flood plains is against national policy.

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat

Strongly agree

The site is home to herons, owls, wildfowl, greater crested newts, bats, small creatures, all of which promotes biodiversity in the area. Developing the site will cause sugnificant loss of this wildlife habitat.

Increased traffic on local roads will cause an increase risk to local children walking to and from school and playing. Parking outside existing primary schools is already a problem, this will increase with the development. Construction traffic on local roads will be a particular problem for these reasons. With only one access to the proposed estate, access for emergency vehicles will be a problem.

North Comments

Name: J M Turner

Representor No: PRS00779 Representation ID: REP02790

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

The schools, buses, roads, trains are overloaded already and these are not enough shops, or playing fields or parks in this area.

Shop at times it is very difficult to drive down green lane because of the traffic parked outside the school and at the junction of Moorhill Rd and Tinshill lane. More houses would increase the problem.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

As there is only one entrance there would be massive problems for emergency vehicle and with parking on the road , delivery vehicles are a big problem. This is already showing without more traffic especially outside the school and.

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

A possible increase in the number of children in the area will give a huge problem for the oversubscribed schools in the area now.

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

As there is already heavy flooding experienced in the proposed site, I am surprised that this site is being considered as it is against the national policy after the serious flooding as in 2007.

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

We have seen herons, owls, wild fowl, created newts, frogs, bats small animals and this is very important. It is tragic to think of losing this. It raises the moral of the present inhabitants to feel unhindered by impling the area and faling "shut in" by too many houses.

North Comments

Name: Carol Turner

Representor No: PRS01204 **Representation ID:** REP03306

Question Ref: H1

I am writing to oppose the application to build houses on two sites.

Church Lane Adel (ref 2130)
Land South of Dunstarn Lane Adel (ref 1178A)

I have lived in Adel for more than twenty years and already seen considerable housing development taking place. Currently there are new houses being built at Centurion Fields and on the Bodington Hall site. There is insufficient infrastructure already for these developments without the new areas for development that is being proposed. In particular there is no primary school provision which will mean more children travelling further to go to school, this is at considerable cost to the environment in that it will create more car journeys. Our roads are already congested at peak times and this will become significantly worse.

In addition there will be a significant environmental impact should this proposal be approved and all the consequences that accompany the loss of green belt in terms of loss of habitat for birds and animals and loss of vegetation, in particular mature trees. Development on brown field sites should only be approved for these reasons.

I find it interesting that when I contacted the planning department at the beginning of this year to try and buy a small piece of green belt to extend my garden I was refused on the grounds that change of use would not be approved and that the sale would lead to other requests to purchase land. The Council is proposing to change the use of green belt land and so will leave itself open to others like myself having a justifiable application to buy green belt.

I hope that the outcome of this consultation process will be refusal of the above application.

Question Ref: H4

I am writing to oppose the application to build houses on two sites.

Church Lane Adel (ref 2130)
Land South of Dunstarn Lane Adel (ref 1178A)

I have lived in Adel for more than twenty years and already seen considerable housing development taking place. Currently there are new houses being built at Centurion Fields and on the Bodington Hall site. There is insufficient infrastructure already for these developments without the new areas for development that is being proposed. In particular there is no primary school provision which will mean more children travelling further to go to school, this is at considerable cost to the environment in that it will create more car journeys. Our roads are already congested at peak times and this will become significantly worse.

In addition there will be a significant environmental impact should this proposal be approved and all the consequences that accompany the loss of green belt in terms of loss of habitat for birds and animals and loss of vegetation, in particular mature trees. Development on brown field sites should only be approved for these reasons.

I find it interesting that when I contacted the planning department at the beginning of this year to try and buy a small piece of green belt to extend my garden I was refused on the grounds that change of use would not be approved and that the sale would lead to other requests to purchase land. The Council is proposing to change the use of green belt land and so will leave itself open to others like myself having a justifiable application to buy green belt.

I hope that the outcome of this consultation process will be refusal of the above application.

North Comments

Name: Katherine Turner

Representor No: PRS01881 **Representation ID:** REP00951

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

I do not believe that developments on these sites would be sustainable many of them are currently greenfield sites and I believe that as such should only be developed once viable brownfield sites have been exhausted.

Question Ref: H2

Site reference: 1199 I strongly believe that the infrastructure in this area is already stretched due to reductions in a number of services in recent years and that the scope of current concepts for development in the area does not appear to be adding anything materially to the area's infrastructure. The proposed additional housing stock is not supported by appropriate expansion in the area's education, transport and health services infrastructure so I feel that further development will be detrimental to the area and local communities would suffer.

The local primary and secondary schools are already at over-subscribed so the additional demand on school places will not be met locally resulting in more children reliant on car journeys to get to school contrary to green transport initiatives. The transport and road network would not support expansion, there is already significant congestion at peak times and local residential routes are also incompatible with the construction traffic which would be generated during the development phases. Cookridge is also frequently difficult to access in adverse winter weather conditions with transport services unable to service the area in these conditions. This could potentially place any vulnerable residents of new housing developments at risk in times of medical emergencies. This is also of concern as the nearest GP surgeries would be at least over 1km away. The local topography of the area means that the site is unsuitable for development. Rainfall in the area drains towards the railway line and network rail have already had to undertake costly remedial work to the line into Leeds because of flooding issues. Development in this location would lead to increased surface run-off which would negatively impact the railway line, especially as climate patterns are forecast to become wetter (<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-19848112>). Line disruption would negatively impact Leeds as a whole.

Furthermore development on this greenfield site would have an extremely negative impact on local ecology. Butterfly, birds and bee populations are in severe decline and development on greenfield sites such as this one would exacerbate this. I would suggest that this site is put back as a PAS site in the Development Plan

Question Ref: H3

No.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Ref: 1151; 3044 and 3360 The Council should prioritise building on brownfield sites throughout the city first before any consideration is given to any of the green field/green belt sites.

North Comments

Name: Katherine Turner

Representor No: PRS01881 **Representation ID:** REP04054

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. Brownfield sites should be prioritised & this site returned to the PAS site in the development plan. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. The road network is not suitable for any new development without serious investment. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. Schools are over-subscribed, gp surgeries are over 1km from the proposed development: no available NHS places and local dentists. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Development would lead to an increase in surface run-off which could flood railway lines. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Important habitat for butterflies, insects, birds and other species important to the local ecology.

North Comments

Name: Robert Turner

Representor No: PRS01884 Representation ID: REP00945

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

I feel that the current urban landscape within Leeds has large areas of brownfield sites which should be re-developed before greenfield sites are affected. These brownfield sites (often failed factories or similar) are more complicated to develop, but should be considered first as they would reduce the overall 'run down' impression of large parts of the city.

Question Ref: H2

One example of a greenfield site being considered in advance of brownfield is 1199 in Cookridge. This site has poor vehicular access and although near to Horsforth railway station, the lack of an integrated viewpoint means that residents will be forced to use cars to travel to use public transport, defeating the stated objective of increasing use of public transport. The decision to approve this particular development seems to be made on the basis of corporate profits, rather than the enhancement and development of housing appropriate to the requirements of the city.

Question Ref: H3

Site 1339 is unclear what it is coloured, but is only one example of brownfield sites that should be developed prior to any greenfield site.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some 'Amber' sites are fully appropriate for development due to the brownfield nature of the current occupancy. However, others (eg sites in Bramhope [1080, 3367A] and Pool [1369, 1095B] are straightforward greenfield sites which should be preserved as long as possible.

Question Ref: H5

As stated previously, I feel that greenfield sites (eg sites in Cookridge [1199], Bramhope [1080, 3367A] and Pool [1369, 1095B] are straightforward greenfield sites which should be preserved as long as possible. These should therefore be re-classified as 'Purple' until all possible brownfield sites have been occupied.

Question Ref: H6

Site 1199 in particular should not be Green due to the lack of suitable transport, lack of relevant school places in the vicinity since the closure of Tinsill primary school to public attendance and the decision of Horsforth Secondary School to de-prioritise attendance from LS16 postcodes. As a minimum, this site should be re-classified Amber.

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

In general, the 'Red' sites are not suitable for development, but there are some which would be ideal candidates.

Question Ref: H8

In particular, sites 2046 and 2160 in Horsforth are equally as suitable for development as site 1199 in Cookridge. In many aspects, these are more suitable as they are partially brownfield, are closer to more civil and academic facilities and have the capacity to have direct connectivity to public transport, integrating more simply with public facilities such as Horsforth Station.

Question Ref: H9

Sites in Bramhope [1080, 3367A] and Pool [1369, 1095B] should be coloured 'red' as these are currently greenfield sites and sometimes prone to flooding.

Question Ref: H10

It is currently unclear, but there are considerable sites along Kirkstall Road where factories have closed (eg ARLA), or near the Kirkstall bridge which may not be included in the plan. These would be ideal options for brownfield sites and would give greater economic return for the council.

Question Ref: H11

-

Question Ref: H12

-

Question Ref: H13

-

North Comments

Name: Robert Turner

Representor No: PRS01884 **Representation ID:** REP00945

Question Ref: H14

-

Question Ref: H15

-

Question Ref: General comment

I feel that the plan has not been adequately thought through with respect to integrated living, including retail, academic, travel and aesthetic considerations. The development of brownfield sites would go a long way to considerably addressing these concerns whilst having limited negative effect on the city as a whole and local residents in particular.

North Comments

Name: Robert Turner

Representor No: PRS01884 **Representation ID:** REP07746

Question Ref: H1

Site 1199

Until infrastructure improves to cope with existing residents, more would stress beyond capacity - this includes transport, shops and schools.

Cookridge needs no more housing developments.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Additional traffic around Moseley Wood Gardens would cause major issues combined with issues at Horsforth Station which would extend congestion.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. With Horsforth School changing admissions policies and Holy Trinity being over-full, spaces are at a premium.

The area, including Moseley beck, is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Existing drainage can just about cope with heavy rain but hard surfaces on MWB would exacerbate the issues.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Existing animals I have seen include foxes, squirrels and considerable avian populations. These would be scared off by building work and additional houses.

North Comments

Name: Julian Turner

Representor No: PRS04692 Representation ID: REP01614

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

The number of houses proposed for Otley is disproportionately large. The congestion in the town, already severe, will increase in a major way and with stable employment in the town and no new investment likely, all new residents will require transport connections to Leeds/Bradford which are not in place and this will increase car usage in the town

Question Ref: H2

Site 745 (East of Otley)The details of the sites detailed in the UDP have not been published in the LDF schedule of sites and no reference is made to the issues identified in the UDP hearing, especially the need for a relief road to be completed so that traffic can enter/leave the new housing via the new road. As a consequence it is probable that increased traffic in the centre of town and on existing major roads will become even more congested than at present. There is a need to coordinate these planning issues and take proper account of the impacts of these decisions which otherwise will lead to deterioration in quality of life for all in the area.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H6

Two of the current red ites should perhaps be considered for reclassification as amber: Site 2051B and Site 2054. Both are located relatively close to the centre of Leeds with far better access to transport links to Leeds.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Some of the green areas could be reclassified as amber (see question H6)

North Comments

Name: J Turton

Representor No: PRS02120 Representation ID: REP04338

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom - Green to Red.

Cookridge needs no more housing developments, plenty of brown sites to build on.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem, traffic is bad already (i.e ring road roundabouts. Lawnswood, Horsforth, Rodney.

Local schools such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand, my grandson lives 150yds away from local school has to go to Ireland wood 1.5 miles, 10-14 days wait to see doctor.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this, should not build on areas liable to flood.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

North Comments

Name: Barbara Tyldesley

Representor No: PRS01520 **Representation ID:** REP03661

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Strongly agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999 **Representation ID:** REP03558

Question Ref: G17

I strongly believe that these allotments should be kept as greenspace and not developed.

North Comments

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999 **Representation ID:** REP03851

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments- Strongly agree. The green space below the Mosley Woods is the only space for children to play this side of the Otley Old Road

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem- Strongly agree. Kirkwood drive is already a main for mosley woods. It is the shortest connecting road between green lane and kirkstall road.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly Agree. Kirkwood Drive is direct road between 3 local schools.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this- Strongly agree. The area has natural springs these are already effected by extra house extension and hard surfaces.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree. We have already lost enough wildlife

North Comments

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999 **Representation ID:** REP04042

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. Cookridge infrastructure cannot support another 200 houses. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999 **Representation ID:** REP04625

Question Ref: H1

We consider the following sites to be unsuitable for further development and they should be coded red and classified as permanent Green Belt. 1079 Long Causeway, Adel. 2052 Tile Lane, Adel. 1178B Land South of Dunstarn Lane, Adel. 1243 Former Rectory, Back Church Lane, also 1246. 2130 Church Lane, Adel. 3044 Cookridge Hall Golf Club. 3360 Cookridge Hall.

North Comments

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999 **Representation ID:** REP04754

Question Ref: H1

1199 – Moseley Bottom, Green to Red. Strongly agree Cookridge needs no more housing developments.

Strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this.

Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

North Comments

Name: Jason Unsworth

Representor No: PRS05602 **Representation ID:** REP06259

Question Ref: H7

I do not want not should there be any development of this land

North Comments

Name: Niccol Valentine

Representor No: PRS04359 **Representation ID:** REP00958

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Site 1095B and 1369 were preserved as Green Belt areas and are now coded Amber, but should remain in the green zone.

Question Ref: H2

Site 1095B and 1369 are in a dense traffic area during rush hour. As it is, no traffic circle exists coming off Leathley Lane, which is backed up enough during rush hour and would lead to an overabundant traffic jam daily. The main road through Pool, passing the Shell station and heading to Leeds is extremely small and highly trafficked, it would not support all the additional cars. The village of Pool does not have the infrastructure to support an additional 500 houses and more roads would need furnishing coming out of 1095B in order to get to the small road leading into Otley. There is a small pharmacy, no doctors surgery and limited access to public transport during evening and weekend hours. Site 1095B and 1369 lack proper drainage during the rainy season and the flooding could lead to potential devastation onto the main Otley road. Building on these sites could reverse agricultural productivity and possibly lead to food shortages.

Question Ref: H3

Site 2054 Alwoodley Gates could be green or even amber due to less issues with highways and better road infrastructure. The area is not isolated from nearby housing as some of the other sites are and with the surrounding woodland close to Eccup reservoir the boundaries would prevent urban sprawl in the future and could remain natural.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

Site 1095B and 1369 are in a dense traffic area during rush hour. As it is, no traffic circle exists coming off Leathley Lane, which is backed up enough during rush hour and would lead to an overabundant traffic jam daily. The main road through Pool, passing the Shell station and heading to Leeds is extremely small and highly trafficked, it would not support all the additional cars. The village of Pool does not have the infrastructure to support an additional 500 houses and more roads would need furnishing coming out of 1095B in order to get to the small road leading into Otley. There is a small pharmacy, no doctors surgery and limited access to public transport during evening and weekend hours. Site 1095B and 1369 lack proper drainage during the rainy season and the flooding could lead to potential devastation onto the main Otley road. Building on these sites could reverse agricultural productivity and possibly lead to food shortages.

Question Ref: H6

Site 2054 Alwoodley Gates could be green or even amber due to less issues with highways and better road infrastructure. The area is not isolated from nearby housing as some of the other sites are and with the surrounding woodland close to Eccup reservoir the boundaries would prevent urban sprawl in the future and could remain natural.

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Site 2051A 2053A and 2054 are all sites along the river and are unsuitable for housing, the river floods and with heavy rains all areas along the river are prone to high waters and dangerous conditions.

Question Ref: H8

None of the red sites

Question Ref: H9

No

Question Ref: H10

No

Question Ref: H11

I have no opinion on that issue as I am not a planner.

Question Ref: H13

No

Question Ref: H14

No

North Comments

Name: Niccol Valentine

Representor No: PRS04359 **Representation ID:** REP00958

Question Ref: H15

No

Question Ref: General comment

No, thank you.

North Comments

Name: D Valentine

Representor No: PRS06344 Representation ID: REP07317

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom -Green to Red

Strongly agree Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Cookridge is a nicely sized area, with local schools already at a premium. Strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. I live on a main road/bus route at times it is difficult to reverse into my drive way due to the current level of traffic. Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand, there are 2 primary schools which serve Cookridge (where are all the local children going to be schooled. Senior school is Ralph Thorsby – this will be well over subscribed now Horsforth High schools for LS18 kids only. Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat

North Comments

Name: Harry Vasey

Representor No: PRS02529 **Representation ID:** REP04818

Question Ref: H1

Area does not require more housing. Traffic already too heavy, access would cause problems. Wildlife would be affected. Ground previously found to be unsuitable

North Comments

Name: Paul Veevers

Representor No: PRS01386 **Representation ID:** REP03510

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. The area is already full of housing areas. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Tinshill road and green lane are already very busy. These roads do not need more through traffic. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. The health service is already at bursting point we cant cope with more people needing the service. The schools can not manage more children/houses. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Flooding and climate change is a problem of the future. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. I am led to believe the great crested newt is habitat is in Moseley Bottom.

North Comments

Name: Juliet Veevers

Representor No: PRS01390 **Representation ID:** REP03513

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. There must not be a development unless there is another school built!! The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Leona Veitch

Representor No: PRS00831 Representation ID: REP02846

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

Plenty of houses are for sale - if houses were needed there would already be sold!

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

During winter, parking scare already on upper roads when lower roads to lay to use.

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

Railway and bridge is affected - how will commuters get to Leeds/Horsforth easily when this happens?

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

Gray Crested newts live at the bottom of Moseley Wood gardens.

North Comments

Name: William Veitch

Representor No: PRS00832 **Representation ID:** REP02847

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

More than enough houses - ours is for sale but no one wants to buy it!

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

Rush hour through station is already too bad - it will get much worse & no alternative route to get to Pudsey!

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

Only 2 Schools - already full.

4.The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

Flooding will get worse- how is council going to respond to Harrogate/Leeds trainline problems?

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

Unspoilt nature area currently - should build on derelict areas near city centre.

North Comments

Name: B Verikateswaran

Representor No: PRS01627 Representation ID: REP03780

Question Ref: H4

2053B -

I have looked at your web pages of Leeds City Council regarding the post housing developments in the North of Leeds, especially around the Eccup reservoir area numbers 2051 -2054. I note that there is a proposal for building a large number of houses in this area just around the Eccup reservoir, skirting the reservoir.

I would like to register my objection to this for the following reasons:

1. That this is a red kite preservation area around Eccup and we have at least 150 birds now thriving in this area.
2. It is a regular migratory path for the Canadian geese and these settle in the fields between Alwoodley and Eccup reservoir.
3. The tranquillity and peace is home to a lot of native plants and trees which also are home to a lot of wild birds and animals.
4. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty and attracts walkers and nature lovers from afar to spend some tranquil moments.

Given all of the above I am alarmed at the scale of the development planned around Eccup reservoir in these sites 2051, 2053 and 2054. This indeed goes against sensible use of land and against sharing this precious earth with nature and birds and animals.

I strongly object to the development and I entreat you to reconsider the proposal.

Question Ref: H7

2051A / 2051B / 2054 / 2053A -

I have looked at your web pages of Leeds City Council regarding the post housing developments in the North of Leeds, especially around the Eccup reservoir area numbers 2051 -2054. I note that there is a proposal for building a large number of houses in this area just around the Eccup reservoir, skirting the reservoir.

I would like to register my objection to this for the following reasons:

1. That this is a red kite preservation area around Eccup and we have at least 150 birds now thriving in this area.
2. It is a regular migratory path for the Canadian geese and these settle in the fields between Alwoodley and Eccup reservoir.
3. The tranquillity and peace is home to a lot of native plants and trees which also are home to a lot of wild birds and animals.
4. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty and attracts walkers and nature lovers from afar to spend some tranquil moments.

Given all of the above I am alarmed at the scale of the development planned around Eccup reservoir in these sites 2051, 2053 and 2054. This indeed goes against sensible use of land and against sharing this precious earth with nature and birds and animals.

I strongly object to the development and I entreat you to reconsider the proposal.

North Comments

Name: Vickers

Representor No: PRS00286 Representation ID: REP02227

Question Ref: H1

1199 - I am writing to object to the Council's designation of the above site(s) which is currently green.

The following reasons support our objections:

Cookridge is already over-built, hence over-populated and the road structure is completely inadequate as it is. New housing will have a devastating impact on the surrounding roads; they are in a bad state of repair now, so more heavy traffic will cost highways a phenomenal amount of money. However will the dilapidated roads cope with any heavy lorries? The nearby infrastructure and road network is not at all conducive to additional housing. 200-400 more cars on these narrow, winding roads would be dangerous and ludicrous, as there is no easy access to a main road, (there will be many rat runs!)

I just cannot understand the logic in building on this inaccessible land. There are also many buildings towards Leeds that could be rejuvenated and redeveloped for first time buyers.

Local schools and medical services are oversubscribed. It will be hazardous for primary school children when there is more traffic on the main road.

There have been incidents of flooding on the railway track from Moseley Wood Beck to the Bramhope Tunnel, which have obviously delayed trains. Surely, the drainage will be completely inefficient with 200 additional houses. Moseley Wood Bottom is like a bog in winter!

Lastly of course, is the impact on wildlife. Young wild deer have been sited on Moseley Wood Bottom, as well as herons, etc. Does Mr. Pickles want to dispose of all the "green and pleasant land?"

In conclusion, surely common sense will prevail and planning will completely agree that the area is totally inadequate for building on.
Yours faithfully,

North Comments

Name: Vickers

Representor No: PRS00286 Representation ID: REP04409

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom - Green to Red.

I strongly agree Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Already overpopulated.

I strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. There will be 200 -400 more cars travelling on narrow roads, no easy access to A roads.

I strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Schools are oversubscribed now.

I strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. There have been incidents already when trains were delayed with flooding. 200 more houses will greatly increase the likelihood & frequency.

I strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Many fauna and animal habitats will be disturbed and disposed of.

North Comments

Name: I Vickers

Representor No: PRS00810 **Representation ID:** REP02822

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

Traffic would be a major problem.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Agree

North Comments

Name: W J Vickers

Representor No: PRS00811 Representation ID: REP02825

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

Road Safety a major concern.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Unsure

North Comments

Name: Hillary Vinall

Representor No: PRS01410 **Representation ID:** REP03537

Question Ref: H1

- 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Hillary Vinall

Representor No: PRS01410 Representation ID: REP03537

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Hillary Vinall

Representor No: PRS01410 Representation ID: REP03537

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Hillary Vinnall

Representor No: PRS01410 **Representation ID:** REP03537

Question Ref: H1

- 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

- 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Hillary Vinall

Representor No: PRS01410 Representation ID: REP03537

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Hillary Vinnal

Representor No: PRS01410 Representation ID: REP03537

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Hillary Vinnall

Representor No: PRS01410 **Representation ID:** REP03537

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Paul Vinall

Representor No: PRS05058 **Representation ID:** REP05624

Question Ref: H1

•1299A – BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated “GREEN” and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

1033 – GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS:

this should continue to be designated “GREEN”. This whole issue relates to making land available for housing, with the implication that this isn’t easy to come by. It is therefore I think absurd for the proposal relating to this site on Otley Road to include the suggestion that some of the land be used for Retail, Commercial, and/or Hotel purposes. This site is in a residential area, and should be used for residential purposes only. I also urge that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Paul Vinall

Representor No: PRS05058 Representation ID: REP05624

Question Ref: H1

1178A Dunstarn Lane - Green to Red

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

By way of preamble - I do of course accept that the Council have to find land for something of the order of 66,000 new houses over the next 15 years, but feel that the following few 'overarching' observation needs to be emphasised before embarking upon a site by site critique:-

A. It is my understanding that there is a very large area of 'brownfield' site available in Leeds (as one would expect of a major 'post-industrial' city). As a consequence of the profound change taking place in retailing (the move to 'online' retailing) this 'brownfield' is very likely to include large areas of land which have hitherto been used for shops. I think it is essential that the Council, in preparing its plans for the next 15 years, should take full account of all the brownfield land available now and likely to become available over this time scale, for housing development – before contemplating the new development of previously undeveloped land.

B. All ten of the sites considered here have the implication of large numbers of motor vehicles 'draining' to the major arterial roads (the A660 and the Ring Road) via Adel lane, Church Lane, Long Causeway, and Weetwood Lane. These are very minor roads, and cannot bear any further increase in traffic, especially in prolonged rush hours. This is I think a very strong argument against the Dunstarn Lane, Long Causeway, and Tile Lane sites (for there is no identifiable alternative means of motor access), and a similarly strong argument that the Bodington Hall, Government Buildings, and Church Lane sites be required to 'drain' directly to the main A660

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration – not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed.

NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless "very special circumstances" exist. However, the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A – which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of *Britton v SOS*, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

- 1.Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 – Protected Playing Pitch
- 2.site 1178A against other Green Belt sites – for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site 1178A objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327

North Comments

Name: Paul Vinall

Representor No: PRS05058 Representation ID: REP05624

Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear, defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2.SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...",

NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network – tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space
- it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents
- destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" – it will involve destruction of Green Belt and increased congestion and pollution from the vehicles of new residents and the only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s)

NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used: (i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3.TRANSPORT

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network"

NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties"

Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network – tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4.ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places"

NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions

CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to

North Comments

Name: Paul Vinall

Representor No: PRS05058 **Representation ID:** REP05624

protect their distinctiveness...”, CS’s natural habitat and biodiversity aim to “protect and enhance the natural environment of the district”, NPPF para 109 “the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity”, CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements “Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 “local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused”

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced , that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity

In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a “RED” site not suitable for development.

Question Ref: H4

•2130 – CHURCH LANE: keep “AMBER” or reclassify as “GREEN” whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

•1299B – BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as “AMBER” or “GREEN” as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC’s legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite side of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquills, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Paul Vinall

Representor No: PRS05058 Representation ID: REP05624

Question Ref: H7

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B – DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 – LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 TILE LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

By way of preamble - I do of course accept that the Council have to find land for something of the order of 66,000 new houses over the next 15 years, but feel that the following few 'overarching' observations need to be emphasised before embarking upon a site by site critique:-

A. It is my understanding that there is a very large area of 'brownfield' site available in Leeds (as one would expect of a major 'post-industrial' city). As a consequence of the profound change taking place in retailing (the move to 'online' retailing) this 'brownfield' is very likely to include large areas of land which have hitherto been used for shops. I think it is essential that the Council, in preparing its plans for the next 15 years, should take full account of all the brownfield land available now and likely to become available over this time scale, for housing development – before contemplating the new development of previously undeveloped land.

B. All ten of the sites considered here have the implication of large numbers of motor vehicles 'draining' to the major arterial roads (the A660 and the Ring Road) via Adel Lane, Church Lane, Long Causeway, and Weetwood Lane. These are very minor roads, and cannot bear any further increase in traffic, especially in prolonged rush hours. This is I think a very strong argument against the Dunstarn Lane, Long Causeway, and Tile Lane sites (for there is no identifiable alternative means of motor access), and a similarly strong argument that the Bodington Hall, Government Buildings, and Church Lane sites be required to 'drain' directly to the main A660

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration – not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed.

NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless "very special circumstances" exist. However, the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A – which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents – would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of *Britton v SOS*, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

1. Green Belt against other green spaces – for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B

North Comments

Name: Paul Vinall

Representor No: PRS05058 Representation ID: REP05624

(Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 – Protected Playing Pitch 2.site 1178A against other Green Belt sites – for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site 1178A objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear, defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2.SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network – tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space
- it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents
- destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" – it will involve destruction of Green Belt and increased congestion and pollution from the vehicles of new residents and the only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s)

NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used: (i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3.TRANSPORT

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network"

NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties"

Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network – tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4.ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places"

NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community

North Comments

Name: Paul Vinall

Representor No: PRS05058 **Representation ID:** REP05624

•only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions

CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats

- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered

- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced , that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity

North Comments

Name: Sian Virk

Representor No: PRS04175 **Representation ID:** REP00121

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Because in all the proposed development for the Horsforth area, there are no plans for improvements to infrastructure such as schools and medical practices. Nor are there any convincing plans to reduce or ameliorate the amount of congestion on the roads through Horsforth.

Question Ref: H2

235, 3384, 4057

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

1202 Land off Victoria Avenue LS18. This land is greenbelt land and is much used by the local community. The road access for this development would be directly out to Horsforth roundabout which is where the ring road and the A65 meet. This roundabout is already heavily congested. The primary school located at the bottom of this site has recently been expanded and is full. The traffic congestion around the school has increased massively with its expansion - where would the children living on any new development go to school? Bear in mind that the Clariant site already has planning permission & these children will come to school in Horsforth because the council/Education Leeds shut the primary school in Rodley several years ago! This land forms a small but significant rural oasis for the people living in this area of Horsforth. Its loss would have a huge detrimental effect on the surrounding area. Children from the estate play in these fields without having to cross any major roads - to get to the only park in Horsforth, they have to cross both the A65 and the ring road. The fields are also very popular with dog-walkers.

I feel very strongly that Horsforth is at capacity. If we are forced to accommodate ever more housing developments at the expense of what little greenery remains, we run the risk of losing our character & identity as a town and will become instead part of an urban sprawl spreading up the A65.

Question Ref: H5

1202 Land off Victoria Avenue LS18. This land is greenbelt land and is much used by the local community. The road access for this development would be directly out to Horsforth roundabout which is where the ring road and the A65 meet. This roundabout is already heavily congested. The primary school located at the bottom of this site has recently been expanded and is full. The traffic congestion around the school has increased massively with its expansion - where would the children living on any new development go to school? Bear in mind that the Clariant site already has planning permission & these children will come to school in Horsforth because the council/Education Leeds shut the primary school in Rodley several years ago! This land forms a small but significant rural oasis for the people living in this area of Horsforth. Its loss would have a huge detrimental effect on the surrounding area. Children from the estate play in these fields without having to cross any major roads - to get to the only park in Horsforth, they have to cross both the A65 and the ring road. The fields are also very popular with dog-walkers.

I feel very strongly that Horsforth is at capacity. If we are forced to accommodate ever more housing developments at the expense of what little greenery remains, we run the risk of losing our character & identity as a town and will become instead part of an urban sprawl spreading up the A65.

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H9

1202 Land off Victoria Avenue see H4

Question Ref: General comment

I attended the consultation at Horsforth School 22/06/13 after finding out about it from Newlay Conservation Society. The vast majority of local residents did not know about it. Your methods of disseminating this information have been unsuccessful. These proposals affect everyone who lives in Horsforth; they can only have their say if they are aware of the consultation. I am told that the cost of mailshotting all Leeds residents is prohibitive. If that is the case, the council need to be more creative - use the free local press, all households get a weekly delivery, posters in local post offices and supermarkets rather than just the library. If you do not reach everyone, you will be vulnerable to the accusation that you are trying to sneak these developments in through the back door.

North Comments

Name: Liss Vorlicky

Representor No: PRS00050 **Representation ID:** REP00456

Question Ref: H1

1199 - If you intend building in such a lovely area where there is much wild life, a stream and where a kingfisher has been spotted, the quality of life for the surrounding residents will deteriorate and the value of their properties decrease accordingly (many are now having difficulty selling their houses). People are attracted to Cookridge understandably - but do not realise that it is the highest spot in Leeds and is subject to much more frequent extreme weather conditions (very strong winds). I have been here for 10 years and have known some scary moments! Also, the site is near the Leeds - Harrogate railways line (one notorious for problems with the Leeds Bramhope tunnel - flooding etc) How will the developers deal properly with drainage, water etc! Cookridge is already a great urban sprawl with no actual centre. Why add to it? Can't you just leave it be? With all the disruption that this will ultimately cause and the effect it will have on those already living here I oppose vigorously the plans by Taylor Wimpey to build on this so far unspoilt site!

North Comments

Name: Liss Vorlicky

Representor No: PRS00050 **Representation ID:** REP03698

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. It is already a widespread area with no actual centre. Why add to it? The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Young families - children running about -? Noise, petrol fumes - not healthy! Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Unusre. Certainly school places will be in demand, and health centres possibly (A big one is being built at Holt Park) The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Isn't it rather short sighted to propose building in an area that has this reputation? Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Anything that spoils wildlife should be condemned! Building companies have no scuples, it would appear!

North Comments

Name: Karen Waddington

Representor No: PRS05042 **Representation ID:** REP05606

Question Ref: H1

1242 (Assumed) Paddock, Church Lane, Meanwood - Green to Red

I am contacting youell as a resident of Stretton Avenue and formeley of 40 years at Wells Croft , Meanwood.

I understand that e comments have been made on behalf on Transition Meanwood (though without consultation with all members, due to lack of time) on the Leeds Site Allocation Plan in relation to the church paddock beside Church Lane and the Hollins Lane cricket ground, and in less detail (due only to lack of time) to the site between Stonegate Road and Carr Manor Crescent.

I wish you to know that with the exception of the Highbury Cricket Ground (as I would prefer this to be used as something rather than seeing what was a beautiful cricket ground and club but now an eyesore) that I support Transisiton Meanwood and oppose any building plans in those areas.

I trust that you will pass on my objection to the relevant people if this is not on your patch.

Question Ref: H4

2055 (Assumed) Carr Manor, Meanwood - Amber to Red

I am contacting youell as a resident of Stretton Avenue and formeley of 40 years at Wells Croft , Meanwood.

I understand that e comments have been made on behalf on Transition Meanwood (though without consultation with all members, due to lack of time) on the Leeds Site Allocation Plan in relation to the church paddock beside Church Lane and the Hollins Lane cricket ground, and in less detail (due only to lack of time) to the site between Stonegate Road and Carr Manor Crescent.

I wish you to know that with the exception of the Highbury Cricket Ground (as I would prefer this to be used as something rather than seeing what was a beautiful cricket ground and club but now an eyesore) that I support Transisiton Meanwood and oppose any building plans in those areas.

I trust that you will pass on my objection to the relevant people if this is not on your patch.

Question Ref: H7

1170 (Assumed) Highbury Cricket Ground, Meanwood - Red

I am contacting youell as a resident of Stretton Avenue and formeley of 40 years at Wells Croft , Meanwood.

I understand that e comments have been made on behalf on Transition Meanwood (though without consultation with all members, due to lack of time) on the Leeds Site Allocation Plan in relation to the church paddock beside Church Lane and the Hollins Lane cricket ground, and in less detail (due only to lack of time) to the site between Stonegate Road and Carr Manor Crescent.

I wish you to know that with the exception of the Highbury Cricket Ground (as I would prefer this to be used as something rather than seeing what was a beautiful cricket ground and club but now an eyesore) that I support Transisiton Meanwood and oppose any building plans in those areas.

I trust that you will pass on my objection to the relevant people if this is not on your patch.

North Comments

Name: Richard Wade

Representor No: PRS04325 Representation ID: REP00154

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

Sites 1033 and 1299A already have established buildings so I agree that replacing them with housing is acceptable. However access and traffic volume onto Adel Lane is an issue.

Question Ref: H3

Sites 3044 and 3360 should be considered for housing. As schools, doctor's surgery and local roads etc to the eastern side of Otley Road are full to capacity then it seems sense that if extra housing is needed in the North Leeds area that by building on Cookridge Hall Golf Club all the housing would be adjacent to Holt Park school and the supermarket /shops / leisure centre in Holt Park. There would be less reason for the residents to have to use their cars.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Site 2130. There are already an adequate number of developments taking place in the area. Access into local roads such as Church Lane, Adel Lane and Long Causeway are already at over capacity especially at peak times.....these roads are already used as rat runs for cars from Bramhope / Otley and Pool where massive future developments are planned. These are narrow country lanes were never intended for volume traffic. Also local amenities east of Otley Road are at over capacity. Site 2130 should be designated as Green Belt and colour coded red.

Question Ref: H5

Sites 3044 and 3360.....see my comments on H3.

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Sites 1079, 2052, 1178B, 1243, 1246. Traffic and access issues. Lack of capacity at local schools and Doctor's surgery.. It just means that residents will have to use their cars to access other schools and amenities thus adding to the already congested roads

Question Ref: H8

Sites 3044 and 3360.....see my comments on H3.

Question Ref: H9

Site 2130.....see my comments H4.

Question Ref: H10

No

Question Ref: H11

Sites 3044 and 3360 should be developed in the medium term

Question Ref: H12

NO

Question Ref: H13

NO

Question Ref: H14

Sites 1299A and 1033 should be considered. There are many local retired residents in the Adel area living in large houses who wish to remain in their area and who would consider down-sizing if suitable elderly housing accommodation were available.

Question Ref: General comment

Access roads and local facilities are already at capacity. With all the proposed projects taking place in Bramhope, Pool and Otley plus the proposed housing in the Leeds 16 area all the additional traffic will flow down to Headingley and Woodhouse adding to the already near gridlock situation there already is. The whole of the public transport situation and the arterial road systems into Leeds and also around the so called Outer Ring Road are completely inadequate at present. School capacity, Doctors, Dentists, local shopping and shop parking already overloaded.

North Comments

Name: Tony Waite

Representor No: PRS01275 **Representation ID:** REP03384

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Anthony Waites

Representor No: PRS02010 **Representation ID:** REP04209

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly Agree the infrastructure cannot withstand more people. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly Agree especially around schools. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly Agree it is already difficult to get a doctors appointment. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Unsure.

North Comments

Name: Angelique Wake

Representor No: PRS01443 **Representation ID:** REP03574

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. The surrounding roads struggle with the amount of traffic that we currently have. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. There are limited places for schools of choice as it is. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Colin Wake

Representor No: PRS01449 **Representation ID:** REP03581

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Agree. Innapropriate to the community. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Angela Waksworth

Representor No: PRS01194 **Representation ID:** REP03290

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this agree. Moseley bottin is an important wildlife habitat Agree.

North Comments

Name: Robin And Jane Walford

Representor No: PRS01127 Representation ID: REP03184

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1-1-7-8A (ie site -1-1-7-8A-objectively-appears-to-be-less appropriate for- building-allocation), - other - - sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownbarrie Farm) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most

North Comments

Name: Robin And Jane Walford

Representor No: PRS01127 Representation ID: REP03184

positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt and increased congestion and pollution from the vehicles of new residents and the only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used: (i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria..., locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC.

Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment..., is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched" CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscape and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided..., then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: Robin And Jane Walford

Representor No: PRS01127 Representation ID: REP03184

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 — LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

As-regards the following sites:

- 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services
 - 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services
 - 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.
 - 2130 — CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.
- I would be grateful if LCC would take these representations into account when progressing the Site Allocations Plan and would welcome the opportunity to meet, together with my fellow Adel residents,

Question Ref: H1

- 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

- 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

- 2130 — CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Robin And Jane Walford

Representor No: PRS01127 Representation ID: REP03184

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1-1-7-8A (ie site -1-1-7-8A-objectively-appears-to-be-less appropriate for- building-allocation), - other - - sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownbarrie Farm) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most

North Comments

Name: Robin And Jane Walford

Representor No: PRS01127 Representation ID: REP03184

positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt and increased congestion and pollution from the vehicles of new residents and the only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used: (i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria..., locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC.

Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment..., is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched" CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided..., then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: Robin And Jane Walford

Representor No: PRS01127 Representation ID: REP03184

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 — LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: G Walker

Representor No: PRS00025 Representation ID: REP00431

Question Ref: H1

1199 - Having brought our home some 40 years ago because of the green open spaces around us, we now find this large development thrust on us. We do not have the infrastructure to maintain 200 houses our already crowded roads out of Cookridge are a testament to this, as any resident will tell you. The A660 into Leeds is a nightmare any time of day, and so are the roads through Horsforth. Also site traffic will cause major problems on our estate. Access to the site is a big worry having heavy wagons going past our houses and school where 4 to 11 year olds go is quite frightening. In the winter months we can soon be cut off from public transport and often can't get in or out of Cookridge, has anyone thought about that?I hope you will rethink this development.Yours

North Comments

Name: G Walker

Representor No: PRS00025 Representation ID: REP04322

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree It would be a disaster for Cookridge The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree This is already a very busy area around our two local schools the traffic is a nightmare Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree We see this after heavy rain and snow Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat.Strongly agree It is a beautiful area

North Comments

Name: June Walker

Representor No: PRS01283 **Representation ID:** REP03390

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Julie Walker

Representor No: PRS01362 **Representation ID:** REP03482

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Already many problems in winterwhen snow and ice are on the roads.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. Schools already over subscribed.

The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree.

Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Unsure

North Comments

Name: Ian Walker

Representor No: PRS01818 **Representation ID:** REP03987

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Infrastructure is already stretched to the limit. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Unsure . Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Maureen Walker

Representor No: PRS01819 **Representation ID:** REP03988

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Roads are too poor to support more traffic. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Schools are full. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Unsure. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Susan Walker

Representor No: PRS02652 **Representation ID:** REP05098

Question Ref: H1

This is green space. Traffic has already increased on Church Lane because of Waitrose. Where would access be for 25 houses? This will cause major disruption on an already busy road. Some of the trees must be protected thr land is uneven and boggy - not suitable for building on the field has wild life present on it. I do not think it should be considered for future housing developments for these reasons. Also close proximity to graves must be considered. Schools in the area are already over capacity and full.

Question Ref: H12

Your reference to Traveller sites Leeds City Council looked at over a 100 sites deemed possible and then decided none were suitable. So they thought it was best to enlarge the already existing site, with no facilities for the families within walking distance. No families or professionals want it yet you bulldoze ahead with this plan.

North Comments

Name: Catherine Walker

Representor No: PRS03509 Representation ID: REP00817

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

A balance must be made within each area to ensure that all the Green Belt Land is built upon and it looks as though a lot of Horsforth's Green belt Land is under threat.

Question Ref: H2

CHURCH LANE HORSFORTH. Ref: 4056 This site is relatively small but the congestion it would create would only exacerbate the problems we already have due to the 2 schools, nursery, clinic, library and the supermarket. Drivers already park on the main road creating obstructions and then go to local amenities - this would only increase the current problem.

Question Ref: H3

SITE Ref: 2049 WEST PARK CENTRE This site would fit in to the present residential areas and access is mainly already there with access to the Ring Road and other major roads close by.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

LAND OFF VICTORIA AVENUE Ref: 1202 This is Green Belt Land and although I appreciate the GREEN corridor between the proposed build and the present houses, I do not agree that this site is suitable because it would produce far more many problems than we have at present. Access mainly would be a major issue. We are inundated with vehicles at the present time, which has worsened by the changing of Newlaithes Junior School to an infant and junior intake, and the 'Rat Run' which takes place daily by drivers from New Road Side, up Victoria Mount to Calverley Lane to join the roundabout at the Ring Road to avoid traffic queues. We are totally vehicle saturated. This area has a wide variety of wildlife. There are many species of birds, small mammals and bats. Bats are a protected species!!! There is/was a site of special scientific interest up by the college - a pond with rare insects which should not be disturbed. We do not have the infrastructure to support 185 proposed properties, schools, doctors, dentists, roads etc.

Question Ref: H5

LAND BROADWAY 7 CALVERLEY LANE ref: 1016 This proposed site is not suitable because of the lack of access to main road, vehicle numbers and congestion. The Ring Road is a major problem most of the day.

Question Ref: H6

CHURCH LANE HORSFORTH. Ref: 4056 This site is relatively small but the congestion it would create would only exacerbate the problems we already have due to the 2 schools, nursery, clinic, library and the supermarket. Drivers already park on the main road creating obstructions and then go to local amenities - this would only increase the current problem.

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Site Ref: 3327 Site Ref: 3328 Site Ref: 3330 All these sites are Green Belt and this would be a massive chunk of Horsforth's Green Belt. There would be issues with infrastructure and the biggest problem would be access and roads.

Question Ref: H9

Yes. LAND OFF VICTORIA AVENUE. Ref: 1202 For reasons see H4

North Comments

Name: Mark Walker

Representor No: PRS03764 Representation ID: REP00376

Question Ref: G1

All brownfield sites should be used up before any greenspace is even considered.

Question Ref: G2

n

Question Ref: G2

How can there be too much greenspace? It is what makes England what it is. By building more houses on greenspace we are robbing future generations of their birthright. Do not build on fields - they should be used for crops to feed the country and by so doing cut down on imports - housing is all well and good, but we still need to be fed.

Question Ref: G3

n

Question Ref: G3

There is no such thing as 'surplus greenspace';.

Question Ref: G4

y

Question Ref: G4

Common sense.

Question Ref: G5

y

Question Ref: G5

Common sense.

Question Ref: G6

y

Question Ref: G6

A walk in the fields or through a wood can remove a person from worldly cares. Fresh air and exercise cannot be obtained by walking along a road or through the streets. I do not understand 'accessibility distance standards', if there is a path to it, people will use it.

Question Ref: G7

Greenspace should be looked after, not ripped up, tarmacked over and built on whilst brownfield sites remain.

Question Ref: CCG1

n

Question Ref: CCG2

n

Question Ref: G8

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G9

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G10

Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G11

Retained for greenspace

North Comments

Name: Mark Walker

Representor No: PRS03764 Representation ID: REP00376

Question Ref: G12
Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G13
Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G14
Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G15
Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G16
Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G17
Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G18
Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G19
Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G20
Retained for greenspace

Question Ref: G9
0

Question Ref: G10
0

North Comments

Name: Martyn Walker

Representor No: PRS04676 Representation ID: REP01930

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Further housing development does not take account of increased traffic parking and problems with local road junctions.

Question Ref: H2

1242 as indicated above local transport and parking would be adversely affected by proposal.

Question Ref: H3

No.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

2055 site should be preserved as is and grounds used for Eco friendly food growth.

Question Ref: H5

2055 reasons given in earlier answer plus traffic and parking issues. Insufficient local shops thereby increasing need for use of vehicular traffic.

Question Ref: H6

No

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H9

1242 as stated in earlier answer. If site developed no means of dealing with increased traffic, parking and impact on local road junctions.

Question Ref: H10

No

Question Ref: H11

1242 and 2055. Should not be developed but if no change to proposal should only be considered long term.

Question Ref: H12

1242 and 2055 unsuitable for traveller site use. Insufficient space.

Question Ref: H13

No comment.

Question Ref: H14

2055 after refurb of existing building.

Question Ref: H15

No comment.

North Comments

Name: Joanna Walker

Representor No: PRS05484 Representation ID: REP06122

Question Ref: H1

I would like to highlight a few concerns about the development. I am a local GP and resident.

1. I would value clear assurance that the development is limited in its size and that the remaining woodland has no further plans for development. I would value seeing development of the green space for access/walks etc around a small number of houses.

2. An improved bus service would take the pressure off the traffic issue, ie one that goes directly to Leeds city centre, holtpark Otley and Horsforth. The current bus route is not practical for work as it takes too long going through Tinshill and Ireland Wood. A direct bus service to the doctors surgeries would be valued too. Safe speed calming measures along all access roads would be important. Increased parking at the station would also help.

3. It would be sensible to consult with local services such as GP surgeries schools etc about the potential capacity to absorb the increase in workload.

North Comments

Name: Maria De Fatima Walker

Representor No: PRS05589 Representation ID: REP06244

Question Ref: H1

Objection to the proposed housing development on Land off Moseley Wood Gardens - site 1199.

I am contacting you to express my objections to this development based on the following concerns:

A- Increased Traffic

The Construction of 200 houses will mean at least 200 extra motor vehicles (more likely double that since most households have a least 2 cars) driving through what are already very congested streets with parking. Most homes in the Moseley Wood area have single driveways which mean that the 'second' car is parked on the street.

200 (minimum) extra cars driving through such congested streets will add to the problems we are already facing when driving through them.

With only one access to the proposed housing area (Moseley Wood Rise), cars that will come and go from/to the proposed development, and wish to go to Otley Old Road will either:

1) Drive through Moseley Wood Gardens, Grove, Drive, with its parking problems as I just mentioned above.

2) Drive towards Green Lane, which is absolute mayhem during school starting and finishing time.

Extra transport on these streets will cause havoc not to mention the damage that tends to take longer than it should to be repaired.

Cars that will come and go from/to the proposed development to Horsforth will have to use the already very busy and very congested (with street parking) Green Lane - Wood Hill Road.

The section of Tinshill Road, between Wood Hill Road and Horsforth Railway Bridge, is narrow, congested and dangerous because of car parking by railway commuters.

Driving along this section of this street, when facing an oncoming bus, is a challenge.

The instigation to use Public transport has not been matched with the provision of car parking, and the result is that Horsforth railway commuters have had to park on the street. Indeed car parking is now creeping up to Tinshill Lane making it driving through also rather hazardous.

Also I have witness the potential danger around Horsforth Bridge at around 3.30 p.m. when children are coming from school. There are 2 sets of pedestrian traffic lights but very young people don't always have the patience to wait to cross, and some cars are too quick on the amber.

Forcing extra traffic over that bridge is asking for trouble.

To be added to the above issues there will be the extra heavy transport of lorries that we will have to endure during construction of the new proposed housing on this site.

B- Infrastructure

Cookridge can boast of having very few amenities and it happens that one primary school, post office, mini market and bus stop are all within 100m on the busiest section of Green Lane, contributing to the congestions mention in section A.

Cookridge Holy Trinity C of E Primary School is popular and has undergone recent building to accommodate more children. It is fully subscribed and has no more space for expansion. Has the Council taken into consideration where primary school age children from around 200 households will be placed?

If they are not placed locally it will add to increased problems mention in section A.

We do not have a Health Centre, Library or shops that could encourage us to walk and leave transport at home. So why increase the number of households in this particular site when there are 'red' sites with easier access to major roads?

My objection is not a matter of 'not on my backyard' but of common sense when planning new housing. I suggest that this site is put back as a PAS site in the Development Plan and that the Council prioritises building on brownfield sites throughout the city first before any consideration is given to any of the green field/green belt sites.

North Comments

Name: Tracie Walker

Representor No: PRS05668 **Representation ID:** REP06333

Question Ref: H7

Site 1310 should NOT be considered suitable for building on it's a beauty spot in the conservation area, the impact on our very over stretched doctors schools and roads would be huge, not to mention the impact on the wild life and trees which all have Blanket Tree Preservation orders on them, there are bats which are protected as well as all other animals flora and fauna. And it's a HUGE part of our community so please do not allow this to happen, there are already huge builds going on close by and even more coming up we know houses are needed but not on here Please use brown sites which already have had buildings on them, there is not enough of green space left in Horsforth and having been born here I have seen it disappear at an alarming rate please please do not allow this.

North Comments

Name: Carolyn Walker

Representor No: PRS05727 **Representation ID:** REP06397

Question Ref: H1

I am against the proposed development by Taylor Wimpey on Moseley Wood Gardens for the following reasons:-

1) Traffic Hazard.

As the proposal allows for only one entry and exit on the proposed site this will cause untold problems of access into and out of the site, especially at 'busy' times.

The increase in the amount of traffic on Moseley Wood Gardens, Green Lane and the surrounding streets will add to pollution, poor parking practice, the possibility of road traffic accidents and other related problems. There are often problems with parents collecting and dropping off their children at local schools now. More traffic will cause more problems.

2) Isolation of the site.

With only one road in and out of the proposed site the proposed community will be isolated. There will be the need of more access to public transport, which in my opinion is diminishing and certainly will not be sufficient to cope with that many more users. Parking around Horsforth Station is dire now, more users will contribute to this problem. The amount of trains is often lacking for current passengers, more passengers will add to this problem.

The need for school places will put pressure on the two closest schools first and then have a knock on effect on the second closest schools. Parents will be reluctant to have their children at schools that are furthest away from their home.

I fear that healthcare provision will be lacking or stretched unless there is the provision for new health centres. It is difficult to get onto the panel of a GP as it is.

3) Flooding.

The risk of flooding on the proposed site is very real and happens. This should be taken into account. All it takes is a year like 2012 and the site will be flooded and it maybe flooded for long periods. This poses the problems of insurance for potential and existing residents. Time and again builders construct on flood planes and households suffer the consequences.

4) Wildlife.

The destruction of the established wildlife is detrimental to all of us. We should be doing all we can to hang on to open spaces and encouraging the flora and fauna to flourish. We need to balance the requirement for new homes with ecology, we should not sacrifice one for the other.

5) Disruption.

The disruption caused over the proposed amount of time for the development of the site will cause untold problems to local residents. They will need to contend with noise, dirt and dust, pollution and the language often heard these days on building sites for upwards of six years. The building site will inevitably become a draw for the areas young people looking for mischief. Crime could also rise in the area due to the materials and the equipment there.

The large vehicles used in construction will undermine the roads in a huge area to and from the proposed site. Some of the roads in the proposed area are already in poor and deteriorating condition. Six years of this type of use, not to mention the weather during this time will exacerbate the condition of roads further.

6) Safety.

A similar proposal was turned down approximately 15 years ago. This was due to the fact that there needs to be an area suitable for aeroplanes to crash land if they overshoot the runway or fail to make it to the airport runway for any reason. Fortunately this has never occurred but who can say what the future holds? If such an accident were to happen the loss of life would be immense.

Questions of suitability of the site would quite rightly be asked.

The proposed closure of the Cookridge Fire Station on Otley Old Road would place pressure on the Fire Service to provide cover for an increase in population. The one road in and out of the site will cause problems for the emergency services, especially at 'busy' times.

North Comments

Name: Richard Walker

Representor No: PRS06006 Representation ID: REP06828

Question Ref: H7

I am writing regarding the classification of Site 1015; Hunger Hills and land south of Lee Lane West, site capacity 791 properties, which is “not considered suitable for allocation of housing”.

I wish to express my strong agreement with Leeds City Council's classification that this land is not suitable for housing. As previously stated in my letter to Mrs Lois Pickering of 23rd December 2012, I object to development on this site on the following grounds:

1) National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

I have read this document and identified reasons cited within it that apply to this particular land and why it should not be developed. These include:

Section 11 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment:

The planning system should contribute and enhance the natural and local environment. This includes protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, which this site undoubtedly is to the local community. As the planning areas are immediately surrounding the Hunger Hills Woods this will have a significant and devastating effect on the woods. This includes the ecology, biodiversity, beauty and tranquillity of the woods. It will also significantly impact on the conservation and richness of the wildlife, notably the trees and ancient woodland and have potential impact on protected animals, birds and plants, including bats and red kites, which we regularly see in these woods. The woods and surrounding areas have historical significance to Horsforth including coal mining history.

Section 8 - Promoting Healthy Communities:

Communities having access to high quality open spaces for recreation is classed as very important. The land around Hunger Hills and the Woods are invaluable in providing this access for the local community. The woods and surrounding fields are used by members of the Horsforth community of all ages, for recreational and educational purposes. The fields surrounding them provide users with easy access to the woods. As Horsforth is not far from the city centre it is very important to be able to have quick and easy access to open space to enable healthy living. Development of this land would represent a significant loss of open space.

This land has numerous public rights of way and access and the NPPF states these should be protected and enhanced by local authorities.

Section 9 - Protecting Green Belt Land:

The Protection of Greenbelt land is identified as serving five purposes in the document. Hunger Hills and the West End Lane land is Greenbelt land and I feel all of these purposes apply to this land. The document also states when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure substantial weight is given to any potential harm to the greenbelt.

2) Brown Fields Site:

The NPPF also asks councils to look at alternative Brownfield sites instead of developing Greenbelt Sites. Within the immediate vicinity of Horsforth there is already permission to build 2500 houses on Brownfield sites. These include the Woodside Quarry, Kirkstall Forge and Clariant sites. This will add further strain to an already inadequate road network around Horsforth and the surrounding areas.

3) Infrastructure:

There are also issues with the land in relation to the infrastructure of the land and surrounding area. I believe the proposed development land has a major gas pipe running through it, which could potentially cause major problems, issues and damage if the land were to be developed. The immediate road access to the proposed development land is also very poor as it consists of narrow country roads which are already overwhelmed by traffic and in addition, some parts of the roads have no pavement access. Horsforth is already very populated and the infrastructures around it often struggle to cope.

The local Primary and Secondary Schools are oversubscribed every year and the NPPF states the government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. As the current situation stands, school places are barely meeting the needs of the existing community and they would be unable to meet the needs of a new housing community on this proposed site as well as on the Brownfield sites already approved for development.

The road network is already overwhelmed especially in the morning and evening rush hours, with not only congestion on the immediate Horsforth Roads but also within the wider area. This includes the outer ring road and routes leading out to Bradford to name just two, where people are trying to commute to get to work. It is inconceivable that this road network could cope with any further large scale projects alongside the current projects already agreed.

4) Personal History

On a personal note this land is an integral part of life for my young family. My two young boys love walking through the fields and going to play in the woods; indeed we enjoyed a walk across the fields only yesterday, during which we met other young families walking dogs and observed a red kite and cattle grazing in some of the fields. We are very fortunate to currently have safe and easy access to this beautiful and lovely area. We frequently walk through the woods, not only for accessing areas of Horsforth, but also purely for enjoyment, regardless of the weather. In addition my children have both used the woods during class outings and trips with uniform organisations, to further their education and their appreciation of nature. Amongst the many and varied wildlife in the woods, we particularly enjoy spotting red kites, listening out for the first sounds of woodpeckers every spring and the appearance of the swathes of bluebells. As a family we also value being able to take part in the annual treasure hunt and bluebell walk organised by the Friends of Hunger Hills, of which my two children are members. During the periods of snowfall earlier this year, our young boys enjoyed sledging down the slopes of the fields surrounding Hunger Hills on several occasions, along with what must have numbered several hundred other local children.

To reiterate, for the reasons listed above I agree with Leeds City Council's classification of site 1015 that it is “not considered suitable for allocation of housing”.

I hope all of these above issues will be considered as part of your consultation process and I thank you for taking the time to read this letter.

Please send me an acknowledgement to confirm you have received this letter.

North Comments

Name: Samantha Walker

Representor No: PRS06007 Representation ID: REP06831

Question Ref: H7

I am writing regarding the classification of Site 1015; Hunger Hills and land south of Lee Lane West, site capacity 791 properties, which is "not considered suitable for allocation of housing".

I wish to express my strong agreement with Leeds City Council's classification that this land is not suitable for housing. As previously stated in my letter to Mrs Lois Pickering of 23rd December 2012, I object to development on this site on the following grounds:

1) National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

I have read this document and identified reasons cited within it that apply to this particular land and why it should not be developed. These include:

Section 11 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment:

The planning system should contribute and enhance the natural and local environment. This includes protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, which this site undoubtedly is to the local community. As the planning areas are immediately surrounding the Hunger Hills Woods this will have a significant and devastating effect on the woods. This includes the ecology, biodiversity, beauty and tranquillity of the woods. It will also significantly impact on the conservation and richness of the wildlife, notably the trees and ancient woodland and have potential impact on protected animals, birds and plants, including bats and red kites, which we regularly see in these woods. The woods and surrounding areas have historical significance to Horsforth including coal mining history.

Section 8 - Promoting Healthy Communities:

Communities having access to high quality open spaces for recreation is classed as very important. The land around Hunger Hills and the Woods are invaluable in providing this access for the local community. The woods and surrounding fields are used by members of the Horsforth community of all ages, for recreational and educational purposes. The fields surrounding them provide users with easy access to the woods. As Horsforth is not far from the city centre it is very important to be able to have quick and easy access to open space to enable healthy living. Development of this land would represent a significant loss of open space.

This land has numerous public rights of way and access and the NPPF states these should be protected and enhanced by local authorities.

Section 9 - Protecting Green Belt Land:

The Protection of Greenbelt land is identified as serving five purposes in the document. Hunger Hills and the West End Lane land is Greenbelt land and I feel all of these purposes apply to this land. The document also states when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure substantial weight is given to any potential harm to the greenbelt.

2) Brown Fields Site:

The NPPF also asks councils to look at alternative Brownfield sites instead of developing Greenbelt Sites. Within the immediate vicinity of Horsforth there is already permission to build 2500 houses on Brownfield sites. These include the Woodside Quarry, Kirkstall Forge and Clariant sites. This will add further strain to an already inadequate road network around Horsforth and the surrounding areas.

3) Infrastructure:

There are also issues with the land in relation to the infrastructure of the land and surrounding area. I believe the proposed development land has a major gas pipe running through it, which could potentially cause major problems, issues and damage if the land were to be developed. The immediate road access to the proposed development land is also very poor as it consists of narrow country roads which are already overwhelmed by traffic and in addition, some parts of the roads have no pavement access. Horsforth is already very populated and the infrastructures around it often struggle to cope.

The local Primary and Secondary Schools are oversubscribed every year and the NPPF states the government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. As the current situation stands, school places are barely meeting the needs of the existing community and they would be unable to meet the needs of a new housing community on this proposed site as well as on the Brownfield sites already approved for development.

The road network is already overwhelmed especially in the morning and evening rush hours, with not only congestion on the immediate Horsforth Roads but also within the wider area. This includes the outer ring road and routes leading out to Bradford to name just two, where people are trying to commute to get to work. It is inconceivable that this road network could cope with any further large scale projects alongside the current projects already agreed.

4) Personal History

On a personal note this land is an integral part of life for my young family. My two young boys love walking through the fields and going to play in the woods; indeed we enjoyed a walk across the fields only yesterday, during which we met other young families walking dogs and observed a red kite and cattle grazing in some of the fields. We are very fortunate to currently have safe and easy access to this beautiful and lovely area. We frequently walk through the woods, not only for accessing areas of Horsforth, but also purely for enjoyment, regardless of the weather. In addition my children have both used the woods during class outings and trips with uniform organisations, to further their education and their appreciation of nature. Amongst the many and varied wildlife in the woods, we particularly enjoy spotting red kites, listening out for the first sounds of woodpeckers every spring and the appearance of the swathes of bluebells. As a family we also value being able to take part in the annual treasure hunt and bluebell walk organised by the Friends of Hunger Hills, of which my two children are members. During the periods of snowfall earlier this year, our young boys enjoyed sledging down the slopes of the fields surrounding Hunger Hills on several occasions, along with what must have numbered several hundred other local children.

To reiterate, for the reasons listed above I agree with Leeds City Council's classification of site 1015 that it is "not considered suitable for allocation of housing".

I hope all of these above issues will be considered as part of your consultation process and I thank you for taking the time to read this letter.

Please send me an acknowledgement to confirm you have received this letter.

North Comments

Name: Louise Walker

Representor No: PRS06285 Representation ID: REP07210

Question Ref: H1

Site 1299A

This development could put significant pressure on the lower half of Adel Lane in terms of traffic volumes. If full permission is granted, access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services.

Question Ref: H1

Site 1178A

This area is Green Belt land – key characteristics of which include permanence. I do not feel a desire to round off housing elsewhere is sufficient rationale for destroying our Green Belt.

Question Ref: H1

Site 1033

Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. Certainly the site should not be considered for any other use than housing – the area does not require further retail outlets, hotels or car showrooms.

Question Ref: H4

Site 2130

Reclassify as Red. The traffic from this development would add significantly to traffic queuing near the traffic lights onto Otley Road, should the development be given access to Adel Lane. The feel of Adel would be significantly destroyed through such a large housing development opposite our most historic and valued buildings. The feel of the public right of way across this field would be destroyed by building around it.

Question Ref: H7

Site 1079

I absolutely agree that this site should be rated Red. Long Causeway is a very small road, which sees high levels of traffic at school start and finish times. It would not cope well with further traffic from another 86 dwellings. The road also very much adds to the rural feel of Adel (with the Causeway running along it). This would be severely diminished by building on these fields.

Question Ref: H7

Site 1178B

Agreed (see comments for 1178A above)

Question Ref: H7

Site 1243

Agreed (see comments for 1178A above)

Question Ref: H7

Site 1246

Agreed (see comments for 1178A above)

Question Ref: H7

Site 1299B

Agreed. Further development in this area would be very detrimental to the look and feel of Adel from Otley Road. In addition, Adel Lane could not cope with the traffic from all of these dwellings.

Question Ref: H7

Site 2052

Agreed (see comments for 1178A above) In addition, Tile Lane is a narrow road which runs past the entrance to Adel Primary School. The traffic from such a large development could significantly endanger the children attending this school.

North Comments

Name: Louise Walker

Representor No: PRS06285 **Representation ID:** REP07210

Question Ref: General comment

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites.

I am primarily concerned with the increase in traffic and the strain on public services as a result of the proposed site allocations and outline my thoughts below:

1. Traffic

We have seen recent housing developments in Adel on Adel Lane/ Church Lane in particular. The current proposals anticipate the potential for another 488 dwellings (across sites 1033, 1299A and 2130), which could all be given access to Adel Lane/ Church Lane. This road(s) is really a small rural, leading into a residential road, yet it is already used as a rat run by commuters seeking to avoid the congested A660.

Given this is a residential area, residents like to walk along this road to visit locals shops and schools, but it can be a very unpleasant experience. Cars race down this road and in many areas the path is very narrow. I do not feel that this is a safe environment for my children and so I am often dissuaded from walking with them along it.

Building more houses along this road will only add to the traffic, particularly as the houses likely to be built are large 4/5 bedroom houses, with at least 2 cars per house.

2. Amenities, especially schools

As already stated above, I feel it is likely that the new housing proposed for Adel is likely to consist of large 4/5 bedroom detached housing. These houses are therefore likely to contain at least 2 children per dwelling. This suggests over 1,000 new children in Adel. Whilst some of these will undoubtedly be of senior school age, the two primary schools within Adel are both over-subscribed and indeed one has a very limited catchment area.

Whilst local schools may therefore be within walking distance of the proposed dwellings, there is by no means any significant capacity for an increase in local children. Children will therefore be required to attend other schools, which will require travel by car, thereby adding to car journey frequency. Those that walk will face even busier roads which are already dangerous to cross, as a result of volume and speed of traffic.

In addition, Adel is very poorly provided for in terms of children's playgrounds etc (indeed, there are none) and so the increased number of children will need to travel by car to attend other playgrounds in North Leeds.

These additional car journeys cannot be in line with LCC's stated environmental policies and desires.

3. Look and feel of the Adel area

Adel is a desirable area as a result of its green space and leafy roads, along with the sense of access to the countryside at the end of Church Lane, next to Adel Church. Further development along this road, particularly close to Adel Church, will further diminish this sense and feel, and extend further the urban sprawl of Leeds. This will undoubtedly have a negative impact on residents' wellbeing, which I feel certain is a key consideration when considering future housing developments.

North Comments

Name: Eileen Walshaw

Representor No: PRS01314 **Representation ID:** REP03424

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. No more housing needed. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Cookridge is a peaceful place and should stay so - why I decided to live here! Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Agree.

North Comments

Name: Neil Walshaw

Representor No: PRS05062 Representation ID: REP05628

Question Ref: H1

3157 Brandon Road (Former St Annes Primary School site) (currently allocated as dark green)

The group are supportive of this site coming forward for housing. However, the group note that any housing provided at this site should be for longer term residents, for example families, key workers, couples or elderly residents, in order to address the population imbalance in the area created by a large number of transient student residents. Given that the group feels there restrictions should be placed on future housing developments at the site, the Group would ask whether this site should have an 'amber' designation rather than the 'dark green' proposed.

Question Ref: H1

1144 St. Michaels College (currently allocated as dark green)

The group are supportive of this site coming forward for housing. However, the group note that any housing provided at this site should be for longer term residents, for example families, key workers, couples or elderly residents, in order to address the population imbalance in the area created by a large number of transient student residents. Given that the group feels there restrictions should be placed on future housing developments at the site, the Group would ask whether this site should have an 'amber' designation rather than the 'dark green' proposed.

Question Ref: H1

3137 Leeds Girls High School (currently allocated as dark green)

The Group notes that this site has an extant planning permission (Reference 12/01236/FU) and therefore notes that this site should have a 'light green' designation.

Question Ref: H1

174 Tetley Hall (currently allocated as dark green)

The Group notes that this site has an extant planning permission (Reference 11/03234/FU) and therefore notes that this site should have a 'light green' designation.

Question Ref: H1

230 Former Leeds International Swimming Pool (currently allocated as dark green)

The group are supportive of this site coming forward for housing. However, the group note that any housing provided at this site should be for longer term residents, for example families, key workers, couples or elderly residents, in order to address the population imbalance in the area created by a large number of transient student residents. Given that the group feels there restrictions should be placed on future housing developments at the site, the Group would ask whether this site should have an 'amber' designation rather than the 'dark green' proposed.

Question Ref: H4

1142 Land and Property at Oak House, Park Lane (currently allocated as amber)

The Group are in agreement that this site should have a 'amber' designation but have concerns that the height of any new building should not block light from properties on Kendal Walk. The group note that any housing provided at this site should be for longer term residents, for example families, key workers, couples or elderly residents, in order to address the population imbalance in the area created by a large number of transient student residents.

Question Ref: H4

2049 - West Park Centre, Leeds 16 (currently allocated as amber)

The Group consider that this site should have a 'red' designation. The group considers that the use associated with this site as a much valued community facility mean that the site should be retained for this purpose or for an alternative educational/ community use. Therefore the group consider that the site should not be allocated for housing as a matter of principle.

Question Ref: H4

3393 67-81 Kirkstall Road (currently allocated as amber)

The Group are in agreement that this site should have a 'amber' designation.

Question Ref: H4

3399 [Assumed 3390] Arla Site, Kirkstall Road (currently allocated as amber)

The Group are in agreement that this site should have a 'amber' designation.

North Comments

Name: Neil Walshaw

Representor No: PRS05062 Representation ID: REP05628

Question Ref: H4

3457 Water Treatment Works (currently allocated as amber)

The Group notes that this site does have significant access issues and therefore the Group are of the view that this site should have a 'red' designation.

Question Ref: H4

1120 Land at Headingley Lane (currently allocated as amber)

The grazing field located next to Hinsley Hall is noted in the Headingley and Hyde Park Neighbourhood Design Statement as a priority area for improving green space provision and has N3 status as part of the Leeds UDP. The Headingley and Hyde Park NDS goes on to note that if the New Generation Transport scheme goes ahead that this site presents an opportunity for a green corridor with accompanying pedestrian and cycleways. The Group would therefore argue that this site should have a 'red' designation.

Question Ref: H7

1020 Rear of 39 Clarendon Road (currently allocated as red)

The Group were of the view that this site, which is subject to enforcement action by the Council to return the rear part of the site to landscaped garden, should have a 'red' designation.

Question Ref: H7

3376 Weetwood Sports Ground (currently allocated as red)

The Group agreed that the current 'red' designation is appropriate for this site. The group notes that the site is situated within the greenbelt, forms part of the urban green corridor network and has an N6 (Leeds Unitary Development Plan) playing pitch designation. There are also considerable access issues in relation to the site.

Question Ref: H7

370 Land South of Blenheim Middle School (currently allocated as red)

The Group are in agreement that this site should have a 'red' designation.

Question Ref: H10

Victoria Road Swimming Pool Site (currently has no colour designation)

The Group welcomed that this site was not currently being considered for housing but would like to note that if this site were to be nominated for designation by an interested party that they would be strongly of the view that this site should have a 'red' designation. The merits of developing this site for housing have been highlighted by representations made by local ward members, community groups and local residents in response to two outline planning applications, the most recent of which (Reference 13/00868/OT) is still pending determination at the time of this consultation response. The group feel that the site should be retained as greenspace for the benefit of the local community and would ask that it be recognised that the site falls in an area which is deficient in such greenspace as is recognised by the Council's Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment (previously referred to as the Council's PPG17 Assessment) which was published in July 2011.

Question Ref: H10

Kendal Carr, Hanover Mount (currently has no colour designation)

1144 St. Michaels College (currently allocated as dark green)

The group are supportive of this site coming forward for housing. However, the group note that any housing provided at this site should be for longer term residents, for example families, key workers, couples or elderly residents, in order to address the population imbalance in the area created by a large number of transient student residents. Given that the group feels there restrictions should be placed on future housing developments at the site, the Group would ask whether this site should have an 'amber' designation.

Question Ref: H10

Belle Vue Police Station (currently has no colour designation)

The group are supportive of this site coming forward for housing. However, the group note that any housing provided at this site should be for longer term residents, for example families, key workers, couples or elderly residents, in order to address the population imbalance in the area created by a large number of transient student residents. Given that the group feels there restrictions should be placed on future housing developments at the site, the Group would ask whether this site should have an 'amber' designation.

North Comments

Name: Neil Walshaw

Representor No: PRS05062 Representation ID: REP05628

Question Ref: H10

Woodhouse Street (currently has no colour designation)

This Group notes that a planning application was recently refused by the Council at this site (Reference 12/02712/FU) for a student housing development. Whilst the Group is of the view that further student accommodation would be inappropriate in this area, due to a wider housing imbalance, the group would consider that this site would be appropriate for housing for longer term residents, for example families, couples or elderly residents. Therefore the group would advocate an 'amber' designation for this site.

Question Ref: General comment

The Group would like to note the general point that a more balanced and sustainable mix of housing is required in the inner north west area including more housing for families and elderly people. The Group argued the need for a strong policy to address this as part of the LDF Core Strategy and believes this should also be taken into account when allocating sites for housing in the area. Policy H6 of the Draft Core Strategy makes the case for such a policy and so therefore there is no need to repeat this as part of this consultation response.

The Group notes that in Little Woodhouse there are significant concerns in relation to the high concentration of students (estimated to be approximately 70% of the total population), many of which live in high density developments. There are concerns that this makes community cohesion difficult. There are also concerns that a high proportion of properties in the area have been converted in such a way that now mean that their occupation by families to address the aforementioned population imbalance would be unlikely. The presence of only one school in the Little Woodhouse area (Rosebank Primary School) adds to the difficulty in attracting families back to the area. The Group notes that there are currently nine sites in close proximity to Little Woodhouse which include planning permission for 1697 new residential units. The Group has concern that the vast majority of these units, if built out, would be unlikely to be for family occupation.

North Comments

Name: Neil Walshaw

Representor No: PRS05062 Representation ID: REP05634

Question Ref: E1

2602760 Bodington Hall (currently allocated as employment land)
This site has a current allocation as employment land under policy E4 of the Leeds UDP. The upper half of the 'employment' site has now been granted outline planning permission (Reference 12/04051/OT) for housing as phase 2 as part of the wider Bodington Hall proposal. The Group discussed this application at the time and had no significant concerns in relation to the loss of this part of the employment site for housing. However, subject to the works associated with the New Generation Transport scheme the Group remains supportive of the use of the lower half of the site for an employment use.t

Question Ref: E1

603880 [Assumed2603880] Royal Park School (currently with a 'light green' designation)
This site has extant planning permission (Reference 11/00165/FU) for the part conversion of the building for a community use. The Group would note its support for the re-use of this building to provide a use for the local community in a similar manner or for educational purposes.

Question Ref: E3

2601360 Weetwood Quarry (a large site with a number of designations)
The Group are in agreement with the Council that a large part of the northern end of this site would not be suitable for an employment use.

Question Ref: E4

The Group notes concern in relation to recent discussions for proposals for new retail and similar commercial units in the Burley Road student village area. The Group note concerns that the area suffers from problems relating to desire lines from pedestrians, traffic, a lack of pick-up and drop-off places, noise nuisance and poor provision of waste facilities. The Group also note concern that such development in this area would undermine the vitality and viability of the Burley Lodge Local Centre.

North Comments

Name: Neil Walshaw

Representor No: PRS05062 Representation ID: REP05637

Question Ref: R1

Kirkstall Road Local Centre

The Group support the proposal to introduce a new Higher Order Local Centre in this location. The Group consider that the following amendments to the proposed boundary would be appropriate:

„h Amending the boundary to the East to also include the retail unit at 332 Kirkstall Road

„h Amending the boundary to the South to also include the new Aldi food store which was granted planning permission in 2012 (Reference 12/00207/FU)

Question Ref: R1

Weetwood Far Headingley Local Centre

The Group support the proposal for a new Local Centre in this location. The Group consider that the following amendments to the proposed boundary would be appropriate:

„h Amending the boundary to the South to also include the unit at 66 Otley Road.

„h Amending the boundary to the South to also include the unit at 8 Cottage Road.

The Group further note that this location is noted in the draft version of the revised and updated Far Headingley, Weetwood and West Park Neighbourhood Design Statement as an opportunity for a regeneration area.

The Group would also support the inclusion of the St. Chads Parish Centre in the designated Local Centre boundary. The Centre is a key community asset.e

Question Ref: R1

Royal Parks Local Centre

The Group consider that a significant further amendment is required to the boundary for this new Local Centre. This amendment is shown in Appendix 1 at the end of this document.

The Group believe that the area outlined in Appendix 1 makes a significant contribution to the local shopping function of this locality and would note that this area includes a number of commercial units including a supermarket, the Brudenell Social Club and the Royal Park Public House. This area also includes the Royal Park Yards site which has extant planning permission for a further supermarket (Reference 11/03335/FU) and the former Royal Park Primary School which was recently subject to a planning application to convert the building into a community hub (Reference 11/00165/FU).

The Group are also of the opinion that a more appropriate name for this centre would be the 'Brudenell Local Centre'.

[See plan attached to PDF]

Question Ref: R1

Kirkstall Town Centre

The Group support the proposed boundary changes to extend the Town Centre boundary to the East to accommodate all of the site for the proposed Tesco food store (Reference 12/04200/FU) and to extend the boundary to the West to include the properties to the northern side of Bridge Road.

Question Ref: R1

Butcher Hill Local Centre

The Group would support the inclusion of the West Park Centre in the designated Local Centre boundary. The Centre is a key community asset.

Question Ref: R1

Burley Lodge Local Centre

The Group support the proposal for a new Local Centre in this location. However the Group note that parking in this location is a significant problem and feel that an appropriate highways solution should be explored. The Group note that this Local Centre is discussed in the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Design Statement on page 47 where shared space principles are recommended.

Question Ref: R1

Cardigan Road – Possible Further Inclusion as a Local Centre

The Group would note that the section of Cardigan Road from Royal Park Road to Cardigan Road could benefit from a designation as a Lower Order Local Centre in the future.

North Comments

Name: Neil Walshaw

Representor No: PRS05062 Representation ID: REP05637

Question Ref: R2

Hyde Park Corner Local Centre

The Group consider that the boundary changes proposed to the Hyde Park Corner Local Centre are appropriate.

The Group note that no changes are proposed to primary or secondary shopping frontages in this Local Centre and would like to emphasise the level of local concern about the loss of retail (A1) units, particularly those which are locally owned, over the last decade which have considerably harmed the vitality and viability of the Centre as a shopping destination. The Group consider that a downgrading of any shopping frontages would further exacerbate this problem.

Question Ref: R2

Headingley Town Centre

The Group are supportive of the boundary changes which have been made to the Headingley Town Centre boundary.

The Group would suggest the following further amendment:

„h Amending the boundary to also include 75 Otley Road iV Morgans Estate Agents which was granted planning permission for an A2 use in 2011 (Reference 11/00255/FU)

The Group has a general concern about the mix of uses in Headingley Town Centre, specifically the considerable growth in the number of letting agents (A2) and takeaways (A5) over the last decade which has led to concerns that the vitality and viability of the Town Centre as a shopping destination could be harmed in the short, medium and long term. Therefore whilst the Group supports the upgrading of the units at the eastern end of North Lane from secondary to primary shopping frontage, the Group has concerns that the downgrading of the row of units from 15 to 35 North Lane from primary to secondary shopping frontage will further exacerbate this problem by inevitably leading to a loss of retail (A1) units to the aforementioned uses.

The Group supports the upgrading of the units from 77 to 93 Otley Road to secondary shopping frontage.

Question Ref: General comment

b) General Comments

The Group are of the view that the Town and Local Centre designations are appropriate subject to the changes discussed above.

North Comments

Name: Margaret Walsh

Representor No: PRS00640 **Representation ID:** REP02626

Question Ref: G17

2055 The allotments on the proposed site have for many years provided a unique opportunity for local residents of all ages to join together in healthy activity and for local children to learn about the provenance and production of fruit and vegetables.

The waiting list for these allotments would clearly indicate how much this resource is valued in the area, and would pose a strong ethical argument against the removal of such an important and long standing social facility.

North Comments

Name: Barry Walsh

Representor No: PRS05493 Representation ID: REP06131

Question Ref: H1

I have previously lived in Cookridge, know the area well and am a frequent visitor there. For me it is an area of outstanding beauty, relaxation with a superb mix of housing and natural woodland beauty. The balance is just right and does not need any further change or development at this stage for a number of valid and relevant pressing reasons as follows:

Sustainability – for economic, environmental, and social reasons the proposed development cannot be sustainable in the present climate

Access to medical services – this is part of the infrastructure needs for the area.

There will be a massive detrimental impact on access to both primary and secondary school places.

Highways issues – there will be a devastating impact of all the proposed developments on surrounding roads for a significant period of time affecting the quality of life of many residents and visitors to the area

Population growth – the population of Leeds is not currently growing at the rate expected and so there is no need for this development

There is inadequate road infrastructure to cope with the additional housing and there will therefore be a knock on affect in the clamour to rectify this should the development go ahead

Significant peak hour traffic problems on surrounding roads

Access to sites will be dangerous and problematic

Potential flooding/drainage issues

The increase in local population and strain this will put on the provision of services and other amenities and facilities

Massive impact on the local environment

public transport issues – the need to improve and increase access to growing numbers of new residents and visitors to the area.

Local job prospects and further pressures– where will people find jobs?

Loss of agriculture – food sources – self-sufficiency and production of fresh air

Lack of appropriate infrastructure – has there been a suitable and adequate needs assessment completed by the council? If not why not?

Potential visual impact for a number of years while construction is undertaken and the lasting impact on the area thereafter

Cumulative impact i.e. over-development of the area once the development is complete and more demands are placed by the residents

Ecology – e.g. wildlife, flora and fauna that needs to be protected.

North Comments

Name: Matthew Walsh

Representor No: PRS05628 Representation ID: REP06288

Question Ref: H7

I write in reference to the above matter and in particular to the above two sites. I understand that the Council have classified these two large sites as NOT suitable for allocation of housing.

I own and reside at 56 Brownberrie Avenue, Horsforth with my young family and wish to make my total support for the Council's decision regarding these sites known.

Both sites are completely unsuitable for housing or indeed any other development for several reasons including:

1. The road infrastructure is already over stretched and is incapable of supporting a large housing development. Access into the site from either or both of Scotland Lane and the Brownberries is incapable of supporting such development and any increase of traffic into Horsforth would be catastrophic for the community.
 2. The road network is insufficient to support any growth to the airport and further housing would limit this still further causing chaos on the local road network which will be devastating for the existing residents and the airport and its customers alike.
 3. The sites are beautiful green field sites supporting an abundance of wildlife and many mature trees which is likely to be destroyed by any significant development and are used by the residents of the local community and wider Horsforth and Cook ridge areas for walking and other activities. It is simply unacceptable regardless of Government policy or the profit motives of developers to destroy this beautiful landscape and to change the character of this part of Leeds forever especially when there are plenty of other far more suitable brownfield sites.
 4. The local amenities such as schools parks libraries etc are simply not suited to any further increase in numbers. In particular there is already too few primary and secondary places in school for the needs of existing residents of Horsforth as well as inadequate before and after school provision for working parents. Short of building new schools and facilities I fail to see how development on the sites could be accommodated even on a small scale.
 5. The sites are on the final decent route for the airport flight paths.
- I therefore fully support the Council's decision and urge the Council to do everything in their power to ensure these sites remain protected from development for the existing and future generations. I would anticipate if the sites are earmarked for development any planning applications would be vigorously opposed.

North Comments

Name: Michael Walter

Representor No: PRS01225 Representation ID: REP03328

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Is it necessary to virtually double the size of cookridge? There are very few amenities and servies already. Are there plans for increasing these things. Probably not. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree.it is diffeult engough getting n and out of cookridge with existing traffic. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Is a new school going to be built? Likewise more medical centres?. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. I have seen this year after year where will the ater go then. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. We are told all the time how it is necessary to conserve wild life here we are with plan to rip everything out - when it suits and money is to be made.

North Comments

Name: Richard Walton

Representor No: PRS03537 Representation ID: REP01091

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

I was lead to believe that "Garden Grabbing Development" was to come to an end. The plot 118 has been subject to planning applications for residential development but have been refused. The most recent was the subject of appeal, by the applicant, against refusal by Leeds City Council made to The Planning Inspectorate (decision date 18 March 2009) The appeal was dismissed.I believe that the issues raised still apply and this plot would be difficult to develop successfully without detriment to the privacy, overshadowing and loss of visual amenity to adjacent properties. The allocation of 6 potential plots without describing their reference to the adjoining properties is ridiculous.I therefore object most strongly to this particular plot being included within the list of Housing Site Allocations.

Question Ref: H2

Map 10 North Leeds, Plot 118, The View, Alwoodley, Leeds 17 FOR REASON SEE ABOVE

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

2053B Without alteration to the traffic issues at Alwoodley Lane/ Wigton Lane/ Harrogate Road / Grammar School junctions this site would help create total gridlock at peak times. As it is now we have a silly situation travelling from Alwoodley Lane to go straight on to Wigton Lane where traffic is held up by traffic turning right.

Question Ref: H5

Map 10, North Leeds, Plot 118, The View, Alwoodley. Reasons given already above.

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

2051A, 2051B, 2053B.King Lane is totally unsuitable to take additional traffic. The junction with Leeds Ring Road is chaotic during morning rush hours with queues of vehicles up to a mile long. The width of king Lane between The Crescent and Alwoodley Lane is inadequate for current vehicular traffic. Any increase in vehicle numbers and large delivery traffic could not be sustained without causing even greater traffic issues than currently exist.

Question Ref: H8

Please See Above H7

Question Ref: General comment

This form is not particularly user friendly.

North Comments

Name: Andrea Walton

Representor No: PRS03952 Representation ID: REP01240

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

The site I have identified in North Leeds is not an ideal site and has already been rejected by an independent review following previous planning applications and is not a vacant site. It does not seem reasonable for the plan for Leeds to be targeting existing privately owned and occupied properties to be included in development plans for the city.

Question Ref: H2

Site - 118 (21-23 The View. The site I have identified in North Leeds is not an ideal site and has already been rejected by an independent review and appeal following previous planning applications, and is not a vacant site. Nothing has changed in relation to the site to make it any more suitable now than it was previously and as such should not be allocated with a status of 'a site with greatest potential to be allocated for housing'. It has been stated that 'Garden grabbing' was no longer acceptable, this is a clear case of such an action (which could potentially also lead to an elderly occupant coming under pressure to sell up their current home).

Question Ref: H3

None noted

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H6

none noted

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H8

none noted

Question Ref: H10

none noted

Question Ref: General comment

The communication and notice period has been very poor - we were totally unaware until local councillors wrote to us which has given us a week to respond.

North Comments

Name: Jeanne Walton

Representor No: PRS05881 Representation ID: REP06626

Question Ref: H7

I am writing with regard to the above site and the Leeds City Council Site Allocation Plan.
I wish to confirm my agreement that this site is unsuitable for housing or any type of development.
The infrastructure in the Horsforth and surrounding areas is already at breaking point with all roads being congested during the day and brought to a standstill at rush hour.
There are already large housing developments in progress throughout our area and the green belt is becoming more and more threatened.
I feel that the brownfield sites surrounding Leeds City Centre should be used for development leaving the green open spaces for the conservation of our woodland and wildlife.

North Comments

Name: S Walton

Representor No: PRS05949 Representation ID: REP06717

Question Ref: H7

Local Development Framework, Leeds City Council

RE: Site 1015; Hunger Hills and land south of Lee Lane West

I agree that the the above site is not considered suitable for the allocation of housing.

For the impact on the following:

1. Local green space
2. School infrastructure
3. Highway Access
4. Richness of wildlife
5. Impact on trees and ancient woodland
6. Public rights of way
7. Protected animals birds and plants

And there is availability of alternative Brownfield Land

North Comments

Name: Rebecca Warden

Representor No: PRS01863 **Representation ID:** REP04033

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. I have an 18 month old son and I worry about schooling numbers. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. I have a family of foxes lining close to the house in Moseley Bottom any development would be a disaster to their habitat.

North Comments

Name: J Ward

Representor No: PRS02423 Representation ID: REP04683

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: J Ward

Representor No: PRS02423 Representation ID: REP04683

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: J Ward

Representor No: PRS02423 Representation ID: REP04683

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: J Ward

Representor No: PRS02423 Representation ID: REP04683

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: J Ward

Representor No: PRS02423 Representation ID: REP04683

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: J Ward

Representor No: PRS02423 Representation ID: REP04683

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: Michael Ward

Representor No: PRS06187 Representation ID: REP07076

Question Ref: H4

Sites 731 and 1202

I am writing as I wish to register the strongest objections to the proposed development of the land at Victoria Avenue, Horsforth. (ref: 13/02965/OT) as I believe that this development will have a detrimental effect to the quality of life of people currently living in Horsforth as well as the environmental impact of the loss of more green field sites. The site referred to as 731 and 1202 in the literature are not sites suitable for development for a number of reasons important to many local residents as well as to wildlife. I live on Victoria Mount and this development will directly affect my family and me and will worsen our quality of life.

Firstly, The proposed development will increase the number of cars in Horsforth. The roundabout at the intersection of the A65 and outer ring road is already a point of serious congestion. The proposed development will increase this congestion problem. The 'Keep Clear' at the junction of New Road Side, A65 and Calverley Lane is already a congestion hotspot. This junction is used as a point of access by many for the school run to the Newlaithes School which is at the foot of Victoria Mount as well as a shortcut by people seeking to beat the queues on the A65. People also regularly stop on the 'Keep Clear' road markings exacerbating this congestion problem. Traffic lights on the roundabout will not solve this issue. The lights that are already there at the pedestrian crossing do not improve access. If anything, they increase the number of people stopping on the 'keep clear' and make access and egress more problematic. Having more homes and increasing car numbers that use this junction for access can only make this situation worse. As a parent, the increase in traffic on Victoria Mount and near to Newlaithes School will effect my child's safety.

The second area around which I would like to register objections is that of amenities. The schools in Horsforth are full. Without further provision for local schools you will either have to increase class sizes having a detrimental effect on the education of our children or force parents to find non local schools, this will not only further the traffic congestion problem but also have a detrimental effect on my family as children may not be schooled with their friends in the area. I do not want either of these for my child. I believe that the council should be promoting local schools accessible by foot rather than promoting an increase in the number of vehicles on the road near schools at peak times which this development will do. There is also a strain on other local amenities such as access to health care. Appointments to see my GP can need to be made a week in advance and repeat prescriptions take 48 hours. Emergency appointments are all taken first thing with the GP switchboard jammed from the moment it opens. Accesses to NHS dental services are also scarce in the area. Without consideration for health services the quality of life of everyone in the area will suffer.

Thirdly, there is the environmental impact that the loss of these green fields will have. These fields are used recreationally throughout the year as play spaces for children as well as walkers. Across the river from these fields is the Rodley Nature Reserve. This does not exist in isolation and development on this land will reduce the available land for much of the wildlife that supports the flora and fauna of this reserve. Much of this wildlife, including birds of prey, require large areas of land to sustain their ecosystem and they can often be seen in and above these fields. Removal of these fields will reduce the available habitat at all levels of the food chain. There is also very little accessible green field land left inside the outer ring road. Development on this land will permanently alter this balance. The quality of life of the residents of Victoria Mount, Victoria Avenue and Calverley Lane will also be lower while noisy and dusty construction takes place. There are other, more suitable brown field sites or sites with better access in Leeds and as such I do not believe that you should not be granting permission to destroy accessible green fields in a beautiful area of the city.

All of the above make this proposal detrimental to area. It will make the streets around it a less desirable place to live. It will take a nice place to live, and make it worse forever. I therefore wish to lodge my objections to this in the strongest possible tone and hope that you consider the above carefully.

North Comments

Name: Michael Ward

Representor No: PRS06187 Representation ID: REP07076

Question Ref: General comment

Sites 731 and 1202

I am writing as I wish to register the strongest objections to the proposed development of the land at Victoria Avenue, Horsforth. (ref: 13/02965/OT) as I believe that this development will have a detrimental effect to the quality of life of people currently living in Horsforth as well as the environmental impact of the loss of more green field sites. The site referred to as 731 and 1202 in the literature are not sites suitable for development for a number of reasons important to many local residents as well as to wildlife. I live on Victoria Mount and this development will directly affect my family and me and will worsen our quality of life.

Firstly, The proposed development will increase the number of cars in Horsforth. The roundabout at the intersection of the A65 and outer ring road is already a point of serious congestion. The proposed development will increase this congestion problem. The 'Keep Clear' at the junction of New Road Side, A65 and Calverley Lane is already a congestion hotspot. This junction is used as a point of access by many for the school run to the Newlaithes School which is at the foot of Victoria Mount as well as a shortcut by people seeking to beat the queues on the A65. People also regularly stop on the 'Keep Clear' road markings exacerbating this congestion problem. Traffic lights on the roundabout will not solve this issue. The lights that are already there at the pedestrian crossing do not improve access. If anything, they increase the number of people stopping on the 'keep clear' and make access and egress more problematic. Having more homes and increasing car numbers that use this junction for access can only make this situation worse. As a parent, the increase in traffic on Victoria Mount and near to Newlaithes School will effect my child's safety.

The second area around which I would like to register objections is that of amenities. The schools in Horsforth are full. Without further provision for local schools you will either have to increase class sizes having a detrimental effect on the education of our children or force parents to find non local schools, this will not only further the traffic congestion problem but also have a detrimental effect on my family as children may not be schooled with their friends in the area. I do not want either of these for my child. I believe that the council should be promoting local schools accessible by foot rather than promoting an increase in the number of vehicles on the road near schools at peak times which this development will do. There is also a strain on other local amenities such as access to health care. Appointments to see my GP can need to be made a week in advance and repeat prescriptions take 48 hours. Emergency appointments are all taken first thing with the GP switchboard jammed from the moment it opens. Accesses to NHS dental services are also scarce in the area. Without consideration for health services the quality of life of everyone in the area will suffer.

Thirdly, there is the environmental impact that the loss of these green fields will have. These fields are used recreationally throughout the year as play spaces for children as well as walkers. Across the river from these fields is the Rodley Nature Reserve. This does not exist in isolation and development on this land will reduce the available land for much of the wildlife that supports the flora and fauna of this reserve. Much of this wildlife, including birds of prey, require large areas of land to sustain their ecosystem and they can often be seen in and above these fields. Removal of these fields will reduce the available habitat at all levels of the food chain. There is also very little accessible green field land left inside the outer ring road. Development on this land will permanently alter this balance. The quality of life of the residents of Victoria Mount, Victoria Avenue and Calverley Lane will also be lower while noisy and dusty construction takes place. There are other, more suitable brown field sites or sites with better access in Leeds and as such I do not believe that you should not be granting permission to destroy accessible green fields in a beautiful area of the city.

All of the above make this proposal detrimental to area. It will make the streets around it a less desirable place to live. It will take a nice place to live, and make it worse forever. I therefore wish to lodge my objections to this in the strongest possible tone and hope that you consider the above carefully.

North Comments

Name: Janet Warrior

Representor No: PRS01546 Representation ID: REP03687

Question Ref: H7

3327, 3328, 3330, 3034 - As a local resident to these sites I agree with the decision that Leeds City Council have considered them all NOT suitable for allocation of housing and therefore should not be developed.

North Comments

Name: Kathleen Watkinson

Representor No: PRS01508 **Representation ID:** REP03647

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Strongly agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: George Watkinson

Representor No: PRS01565 **Representation ID:** REP03712

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Agree. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Unsure. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Unsure

North Comments

Name: Helen Watkinson

Representor No: PRS02240 **Representation ID:** REP04478

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The green belt is a precious asset more housing would destroy this and facilities and infrastructure are inadequate. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Green Lane already becomes very congested in the school/Tesco/P.Office area and is hazardous. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. It is already very difficult to get an appointment with a GP. Schools are also full. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. More concrete equals less drainage equals more flooding. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Ecology and conservation are considered by politicians to be of the utmost importance where it is the sense in destroying an area where wildlife & flora thrive.

North Comments

Name: Norman F Watson

Representor No: PRS01260 Representation ID: REP03365

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Far too much road traffic at the moment, especially at the ends of Green Lane at busy periods.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree.

The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree.

Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Mirian A Watson

Representor No: PRS01304 **Representation ID:** REP03412

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree.

The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree.

Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Peter Watson

Representor No: PRS02132 **Representation ID:** REP04354

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. There is not a shortage of housing in this area. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Local detists already have long NHS waiting lists were wil all the schools go. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Alison Watson

Representor No: PRS03173 **Representation ID:** REP01866

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

When I first looked at the site allocation plans at the information event held on 20th June I was struck by the fact that there seemed to be a much larger number of houses planned for Otley than any other area in outer NW Leeds. I asked about what additional provision would be made for education, medical services and transport and was told that this would be reported on in the Core Strategy but that these reports had not yet been received. My greatest concern is about infrastructure. We do not have good transport links to Leeds or Bradford and for someone like myself who works in Leeds and needs my car for work it is hard to imagine how the roads will cope with the additional number of commuters created by the additional approximate 1,000 households planned for Otley. The roads are at full capacity with only one road the A660 backed up during commuting times. The x 84 while an excellent bus service is also at full capacity during commuting times and suffers from a severe bottle neck from the Lawnswood roundabout into central Leeds. I do not have children in education in Leeds any more but understand that the schools are at full capacity as are the G.P. surgeries. In addition the 1,000 approximate number are added to by smaller developments for example the recent building on Leeds Road, whilst in favour of building such as this on brown field sites it all adds to the numbers of new households. I note that land near Weston Lane and Green Lane which is for sale is under offer. I doubt that this is being sold as agricultural land and although currently a red site is likely to end up being used for housing.

Question Ref: H2

Site 745. There is no reference in the site allocation plan to the issues identified during the UDP hearing regarding this site and yet this informs my thinking on the identified green sites above. As far as I am aware there were substantial issues raised at the hearing about use of this site including the building of the relief road. There was a requirement made to have an agreed planning framework in place and further consultation with the public. If site 745 were not included in the total number of houses planned for Otley I would be in agreement with the proposed sites identified as 'green' in the consultation.

Question Ref: H3

I think Ashfield works would be better used as housing than as an additional shopping/business area.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H6

As I stated in H1 I was struck by the fact when looking at the plans that other areas in Outer NW had large amounts of red sites but seemed better suited for additional. Site 2051B is a very large site which is located next to another large site 2051A within the North Leeds boundaries. This site is: much closer to the central amenities of Leeds, has a much better road infrastructure and bus routes, has current clearly defined boundaries which would prevent urban sprawl. Site 2054. This is another large site which is adjacent to an amber site located within Leeds North area. It is comparatively close to Leeds and has access to the A61. Again it has clearly defined boundaries to prevent urban sprawl.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

See H6

Question Ref: H8

Site 2051B and Site 2054 currently classified as amber should be classified as amber. As I stated in H1 I was struck by the fact when looking at the plans that other areas in Outer NW had large amounts of red sites but seemed better suited for additional. Site 2051B is a very large site which is located next to another large site 2051A within the North Leeds boundaries. This site is: much closer to the central amenities of Leeds, has a much better road infrastructure and bus routes, has current clearly defined boundaries which would prevent urban sprawl. Site 2054. This is another large site which is adjacent to an amber site located within Leeds North area. It is comparatively close to Leeds and has access to the A61. Again it has clearly defined boundaries to prevent urban sprawl.

North Comments

Name: Andrew Watson

Representor No: PRS03406 Representation ID: REP00855

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

2130 very limited local infrastructure such as medical services, locally only 2 primary schools which would not have the capacity to take any significant numbers of additional children and the roads are unsuitable for additional traffic, particularly at peak times when some of these are already used as "rat runs".

Question Ref: H5

2130 very limited local infrastructure such as medical services, locally only 2 primary schools which would not have the capacity to take any significant numbers of additional children and the roads are unsuitable for additional traffic, particularly at peak times when some of these are already used as "rat runs".

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Sites 1079, 1243 and 1246. All on greenbelt land and with very limited local infrastructure such as medical services, locally only 2 primary schools which would not have the capacity to take any significant numbers of additional children and the roads are unsuitable for additional traffic, particularly at peak times when some of these are already used as "rat runs".

Question Ref: H9

2130 very limited local infrastructure such as medical services, locally only 2 primary schools which would not have the capacity to take any significant numbers of additional children and the roads are unsuitable for additional traffic, particularly at peak times when some of these are already used as "rat runs".

Question Ref: H12

No.If for political correctness gypsy sites have to be provided they should be restricted to outskirts of commercial/industrial areas to avoid conflict with local residents.

Question Ref: H13

Millennium Square :-)

North Comments

Name: Alastair Watson

Representor No: PRS03917 Representation ID: REP00980

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

The green sites imply that, of the 2,000 houses sought in the Leeds outer north west area, a total of 1,177 will be located in Otley. Such an increase is totally disproportionate. Given the limitations of Otley's infrastructure, and its poor and distant transport links to both Leeds and Bradford, it is also not a sustainable solution.

Question Ref: H2

Site 745 (East of Otley). Details of the lime green sites, which were carried forward from the UDP, have not been published in the LDF schedule of sites. Thus in the case of this particular site, no reference has been made to the issues identified during the UDP hearing, including the need to ensure that the relief road is completed quickly and traffic only enters/leaves the new housing via the relief road. No progress has been made in addressing these and other issues since the UDP hearing. Critically, there is no reference to the overarching requirement to have an agreed planning framework in place and subject to public consultation.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H6

Two sites currently classified as red should be re-classified as amber. Site 2051B (south west of Eccup Reservoir). This is a very large site that is contiguous with site 2051A located within the Leeds North area. There appears to be some inconsistency in the site references between map and the schedule - the map references have been used. Site 2051B is located relatively close to the centre of Leeds and has multiple transport routes into Leeds. Its boundaries are very clearly defined by existing development, woodland, golf course and roads elsewhere. Contained by defensible boundaries, these will prevent on-going urban sprawl. Site 2054 (south east of Eccup Reservoir). This large flat site is adjacent to the large amber classified site 2053B which is located within the Leeds North area. Site 2054 is located relatively close to the centre of Leeds and enjoys far better access into Leeds than other sites in the outer north west area. This includes a pre-existing access point onto the A61. Its boundaries are very clearly defined with the A61 to the east and elsewhere by surrounding woodland. Contained within strongly defensible boundaries, these will prevent on-going urban sprawl.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

See the answer to question H6.

Question Ref: H8

Two sites that are currently classified as red should be re-classified as amber (site 2051B and site 2054), see the answer to question H6.

North Comments

Name: Anne Watters

Representor No: PRS05587 **Representation ID:** REP06246

Question Ref: H7

I write to say how much we agree with your recent decision to class the above sites as 'unsuitable for housing'. I am a local resident(Brownberrie Crescent) and would therefore be directly affected

North Comments

Name: J Wearmouth

Representor No: PRS00806 Representation ID: REP02819

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

All ready plenty of houses for sale.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

Will be a danger to children.

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Karen Weddle

Representor No: PRS04023 Representation ID: REP01244

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

The road infrastructure is not set up for the sheer number of homes to be developed in the Horsforth/ Cookridge area. There are no plans to improve to the roads/ rail links in the Horsforth/ Cookridge area which is frustrating and foolish. I can't believe that these plans are being considered- where is the common sense and forward planning. We have paid a premium to live in this area, which is already very contested in a morning. Schools are full and over subscribed ! How can these plans even be considered without thinking about the impact on roads, schools and existing residents!

Question Ref: H2

40563384332933314095235405711991015376

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Roads schools and lack of planning by leeds city council !

Question Ref: H5

Already stated previously

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

1015 - Hunger hills woods are precious green space and woodland enjoyed by the local schools and community. Access to the site would be difficult and roads impossible and impractical.

Question Ref: H12

No

Question Ref: General comment

Please ensure the findings of this consultation are actually listened to and considered.

North Comments

Name: Christopher Welbourne

Representor No: PRS03897 Representation ID: REP00686

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

It is promoting the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas.

Question Ref: H2

Site 3329Site 3331Site 4095As well as adding congestion to the A65, it will overload the use of public services such as schools, health services, which the Council are already cutting back on due to Government funding cuts.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

Site 3329Site 3331Site 4095As well as adding to the congestion already on the A65, it will overload the public services in the area - e.g schools, health services which are already being cut back by the Council.

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

3034 and 3328

Question Ref: H11

1308 -- short to medium term

Question Ref: H12

No

Question Ref: H13

No

North Comments

Name: Weldon

Representor No: PRS02441 Representation ID: REP04704

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly disagree The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly disagree
Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly disagree The area including Moseley
beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Disagree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly disagree

North Comments

Name: A F & S M Welham

Representor No: PRS05612 Representation ID: REP06269

Question Ref: H7

This site is presently listed as not suitable for allocation of housing and we fully agree with this classification

Our main concerns are

Negative impact on the character and history of the locality. This is a piece of land which has a lot of history attached to it ,both for farming and mining and it is important to retain these links

Increased volume of traffic especially on West End Lane which is becoming more and more dangerous. The number of vehicles using West End Lane has increased greatly in recent years and many have little regard for the speed limit. The junction with Bayton Lane becomes more and more difficult and dangerous. Hence an increase of traffic would exacerbate these problems .

Overdevelopment of the area. This is currently an area of woodland and pathways which has been loved and used by local residents for many many years. There is abundant wildlife within the area also. It seems totally unnecessary to destroy this beautiful locality, particularly when there are several brownfield sites that could be developed instead

The loss of existing views from surrounding properties would adversely affect the the residential amenity of neighbourhood owners.

North Comments

Name: Phil Weller

Representor No: PRS00613 **Representation ID:** REP02595

Question Ref: G17

2055 . The allotments on Stonegate Road should be retained as green space. Firstly, any new houses would create more traffic on an already affect the views, privacy and green outlook which was a major factor in buying the property. I don't want there to be any houses, flats or other buildings created on such a small plot of land which is a valuable space for allotment owners.

I also feel that the consultation period has been open much longer than I had realised, and in no way had nearby residents, who will be hugely affected by the decision, been made fully aware of any plans or information. Green space, no matter what use, are vital to many city residents and the more we confine to build or then, the more harm it does to local wildlife and people's attitudes to daily life.

North Comments

Name: Fiona Wharton

Representor No: PRS04731 Representation ID: REP01243

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

Well spread around the area with direct access to major roads in general .

Question Ref: H3

No

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

1202 - reasons - large development with access through residential family area. Already hugely congested area around tnewlaithes primary school with dangerous traffic congestion at school drop off pick up times . Terraced and semi housing on Victoria's and newlaithes roads have limited drive space so most houses have at least 1 car parked on road making these streets often impassible for residents and access is very poor . The horsforth roundabout A65 route is grid locked around rush hour - a situation which will only get worse when the green allocations of kirkstall forge and calverley lane developments take place . Adding even more housing to filter onto this already congested route will cripple the roads . The doctors surgery on new roadside cannot cope with the number of residents in this area and the local primary schools have already expanded so can't take more children . Furthermore the area is highly valued as recreational land which is well used by families . It has a vast diversity of plant and animal life and its destruction would takeaway this area of natural beauty. Lastly, we fear for the safety of our children by having a greater volume of traffic condensed into a small compact network of streets which are on hills. The hills cause cars to generate more speed!

Question Ref: H6

Non

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H11

626 - kirkstall short term should be developed with a train station as large site close to town with station would be ideal for commute and not add to traffic congestion in horsforth

Question Ref: H12

No!

Question Ref: H13

4094

Question Ref: General comment

No

North Comments

Name: Angela Wheatley

Representor No: PRS00492 **Representation ID:** REP02440

Question Ref: G17

2055 – I would prefer that the allotments on Stonegate Road remain as green space. The Moortown ward falls significantly short of the recommended standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of allotments.

The allotments are well established and every plot is allocated and kept to a high standard, with a long waiting list, proving them an integral part of the community. The site promotes healthy activity, is successful and gives a sense of well being to both users and local residents.

The green space separates existing developments in Meanwood and is a shield from the busy Stonegate Road, the trees especially improve air quality.

The allotments provide important habitat for wildlife which is diverse and developing this varied habitat would have an adverse impact on nature conservation.

The site also provides a safe and welcome boundary to a number of adjoining properties.

Any development on this site would contribute traffic and another exit onto an already very busy main road. In addition there may be drainage problems that could contribute to flooding down the hill in Meanwood that currently exists, which would be exacerbated by additional run off and waste water from new housing.

The allotments should be conserved as valuable and cultivated green space.

North Comments

Name: Richard Wheatley

Representor No: PRS00626 **Representation ID:** REP02610

Question Ref: G17

2055 To build on the Carr Manor 2055 site would:-

1. Remove a valuable community facility (allotments) which are (and have been for over 100 yrs.) in popular usage.
2. Remove an extremely pleasant, natural barrier to the rear of Carr Manor Crescent properties.
3. Completely destroy an environmentally diverse area with varied wildlife habitats.
4. Seriously reduce security/increase access to rear of Carr Manor Crescent properties.

North Comments

Name: Martin Wheatley

Representor No: PRS02449 **Representation ID:** REP04712

Question Ref: H1

1199 – Moseley Bottom, Green to Red. Strongly agree Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Too much housing.

Strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Roads too busy already, safety issues.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Waiting times will be affected.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this.

Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Cannot destroy these habitats.

North Comments

Name: Beverly Wheeler

Representor No: PRS05600 Representation ID: REP06257

Question Ref: H7

I agree with the decision of Leeds City Council that the above applications are "Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing".

North Comments

Name: R E Wheelwright

Representor No: PRS01203 **Representation ID:** REP03302

Question Ref: H7

3034, 3327, 3328, 3330 - We agree with the classification that site No's 3327,3328 ,3330 and 3034 are not suitable for the allocation of housing development.

Such development would be the start of further encroachment on the green belt and severely impact on traffic congestion in an area where there is already an accident black spot at the junction of West End Lane , Bayton Lane and Layton Road .

The traffic situation is further aggravated by very large HGV's slavishly following their SAT NAV's through densely populated residential roads from Yeadon to the ring road, often past West End Primary School.

North Comments

Name: Jacqueline Whitaker

Representor No: PRS00055 **Representation ID:** REP00461

Question Ref: H5

1202 - I think there is enough traffic leading onto new road side and the ring road. Generations of people have enjoyed the green space there to enjoy walking, playing. The school down there maybe compromised with traffic. New houses should be built on old sites not on the countryside.

North Comments

Name: M Whitaker

Representor No: PRS01968 Representation ID: REP04157

Question Ref: H1

1033 / 1299A / 1178A -

Green Sites — I support the intention to build on The Green Sites at Government Buildings, Otley Road (Ref 1033) and on the Boddington Hall site (Ref 1299A). However, I do not support your designation as a Green Site at Land south of Dunstam lane, Adel, (Ref 1178A) as this currently forms part of the natural green boundary of Mel with wildlife and flora and fauna that needs to be protected.

Question Ref: H4

2130 -

Amber Site - The site at Church Lane, Adel, (Ref 2130) should most definitely not be built on. I most strongly object to this site being used for housing as it stands directly in front of the 12th century Norman Church in Mel which for some 600 years has been surrounded by green fields. I feel that as there are already plans for more housing in Add this particular field should not be encroached upon. Building on this field would result in far too much over development of this very rural part of Adel and the visual impact would completely spoil the aspect of the Church — which is visited by a great many people from other parts of the country. Additionally, Church Lane already has a great deal of traffic as this quiet road is used as a cut through for people from Atwood ley and Harrogate as they travel towards the Ring Road and Leeds.

Question Ref: H7

1079 / 2052 / 1178B / 1243 / 1246 -

Red Sites — I do fully support the designation of the following "Red" sites:

Long Causeway, Adel (Ref 1079)

Tile- LaneAdel (Ref 2052)

Land south of Dunstarn Lane, Adel (Ref 11788)

Former Rectory/Paddock, Back Church Lane (Ref 1243)

Former Rectory/Paddock, Back Church Lane (Ref 1246)

My reasons are as follows: Currently there is no appropriate infrastructure to support further housing development in Adel With some 300 dwellings planned for the Government Buildings site and the Boddington Hall site (plus the houses already being built at Centurian Fields, Holt Avenue) there is a huge lack of school places for children in the Adel area. The increase in the local population would have a great impact on Adel with insufficient services and many highways issues. The impact of further developments in the surrounding roads in Add and Lawnswood would be huge — everyone knows how long it takes at the moment to travel to Leeds, and the Headingley bottleneck would become even greater. (I am not persuaded that the NGT trolley bus scheme is a good idea but even if it happens, then trolley buses and even more cars would clog up the roads even more).

I think that more development would have a catastrophic impact on our environment and, if anything is needed, it is not big five bedroomed houses for large families but small starter homes for young couples and single parent families and also dwellings which would be suitable for elderly couples and singles (particularly for those who currently live in large houses in Adel and who would like to downsize for whatever reason). However the building companies all want to build big dwellings where there is, presumably, more profit.

I hope that my concerns will be taken into account and will await with interest the next stages of the consultation.

North Comments

Name: Christine Whitaker

Representor No: PRS05690 **Representation ID:** REP06356

Question Ref: H7

I agree that land 1310 on outwood lane should be classified red - unsuitable to build on

North Comments

Name: Rosanna Whitehead

Representor No: PRS01915 Representation ID: REP04091

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Rosanna Whitehead

Representor No: PRS01915 Representation ID: REP04091

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Rosanna Whitehead

Representor No: PRS01915 Representation ID: REP04091

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Rosanna Whitehead

Representor No: PRS01915 **Representation ID:** REP04091

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Rosanna Whitehead

Representor No: PRS01915 Representation ID: REP04091

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Rosanna Whitehead

Representor No: PRS01915 Representation ID: REP04091

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Rosanna Whitehead

Representor No: PRS01915 **Representation ID:** REP04091

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: George Whitehead

Representor No: PRS02574 Representation ID: REP04871

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: George Whitehead

Representor No: PRS02574 Representation ID: REP04871

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: George Whitehead

Representor No: PRS02574 Representation ID: REP04871

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: George Whitehead

Representor No: PRS02574 Representation ID: REP04871

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: George Whitehead

Representor No: PRS02574 Representation ID: REP04871

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: George Whitehead

Representor No: PRS02574 Representation ID: REP04871

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 — LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Robert Whitehead

Representor No: PRS03115 Representation ID: REP01606

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

I have lived in LS16 for 40 years and cannot believe the proposed allocation of housing that the Council are now planning for Adel and Bramhope.

In particular 348 new homes in Adel; around Adel Lane, (Boddington Hall) Dunstarn Lane, Church Lane and Holt Park. Adel is a small community with schools and health provision stretched to capacity. The traffic currently on Adel Lane and Long Causeway is already horrendous at peak times with cars flying down at 40-60mph utilising these secondary roads as 'rat runs' to avoid the congestion on the Otley Road. These plans will obviously make this situation intolerable for local residents and will in turn drive down house values. Adel simply cannot take this amount of development so quickly and without infrastructure upgrades, which again in far from desirable. We are also aware of major new housing allocations in Bramhope, behind Creskeld Lane in particular (up to 350 houses). Again, Bramhope is a small village with limited local amenity, it could not cope with this level of development without new primary schools, medical centres and play areas. The Otley Road at peak times from Bramhope into Leeds City Centre is hugely congested with delays along the route. This development would create a virtual car park from Bramhope all the way into Leeds. Could the Council please let me know the reasons for suddenly deciding to target Adel and Bramhope (two lovely villages) for so much growth? We do not want it and the area simply cannot take it.

Question Ref: H2

Site Reference Numbers; Adel - 2130, 684, 1299A, 1033, 3010, 687, 1178A, 685 Bramhope - 1080, 3367A In particular 348 new homes in Adel; around Adel Lane, (Boddington Hall) Dunstarn Lane, Church Lane and Holt Park. Adel is a small community with schools and health provision stretched to capacity. The traffic currently on Adel Lane and Long Causeway is already horrendous at peak times with cars flying down at 40-60mph utilising these secondary roads as 'rat runs' to avoid the congestion on the Otley Road. These plans will obviously make this situation intolerable for local residents and will in turn drive down house values. Adel simply cannot take this amount of development so quickly and without infrastructure upgrades, which again in far from desirable. We are also aware of major new housing allocations in Bramhope, behind Creskeld Lane in particular (up to 350 houses). Again, Bramhope is a small village with limited local amenity, it could not cope with this level of development without new primary schools, medical centres and play areas. The Otley Road at peak times from Bramhope into Leeds City Centre is hugely congested with delays along the route. This development would create a virtual car park from Bramhope all the way into Leeds. Could the Council please let me know the reasons for suddenly deciding to target Adel and Bramhope (two lovely villages) for so much growth? We do not want it and the area simply cannot take it.

Question Ref: H3

Not on the Maps I have viewed.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H5

Site Reference Numbers; Adel - 2130, 684, 1299A, 1033, 3010, 687, 1178A, 685 Bramhope - 1080, 3367A In particular 348 new homes in Adel; around Adel Lane, (Boddington Hall) Dunstarn Lane, Church Lane and Holt Park. Adel is a small community with schools and health provision stretched to capacity. The traffic currently on Adel Lane and Long Causeway is already horrendous at peak times with cars flying down at 40-60mph utilising these secondary roads as 'rat runs' to avoid the congestion on the Otley Road. These plans will obviously make this situation intolerable for local residents and will in turn drive down house values. Adel simply cannot take this amount of development so quickly and without infrastructure upgrades, which again in far from desirable. We are also aware of major new housing allocations in Bramhope, behind Creskeld Lane in particular (up to 350 houses). Again, Bramhope is a small village with limited local amenity, it could not cope with this level of development without new primary schools, medical centres and play areas. The Otley Road at peak times from Bramhope into Leeds City Centre is hugely congested with delays along the route. This development would create a virtual car park from Bramhope all the way into Leeds. Could the Council please let me know the reasons for suddenly deciding to target Adel and Bramhope (two lovely villages) for so much growth? We do not want it and the area simply cannot take it.

Question Ref: H6

No amber allocation on the maps I have viewed.

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: General comment

Please protect our villages and rural areas and have due consideration for the current residents and the current congestion already in the LS16 area.

North Comments

Name: Margaret Whiteley

Representor No: PRS02697 **Representation ID:** REP05154

Question Ref: H4

I am a resident in the area of Victoria Avenue (site 1202) and am very concerned with regards to the possible housing development in nearby fields and I object most strongly.

Already there are hundreds of houses being built on the old Sandoz plant and this development will only add to the problems of highway access, overfilled schools, doctors etc. etc. - the list goes on. It is situated near the very busy roundabout and the inevitable increase in traffic (at least 1 car per house) plus college traffic will only exacerbate this. The nearby Newlaithes School has only just been extended and is already full.

A further 185 properties will badly affect the area and put further pressure on the facilities and destroy open Green space that we all value and enjoy.

I strongly believe this site is unsuitable for housing

North Comments

Name: Margaret Whiteley

Representor No: PRS05326 **Representation ID:** REP05923

Question Ref: H4

Dear Sir, I am a resident in the area of Victoria Avenue (site number 1202)and am very concerned about the possible housing development in the nearby fields and I object to this most strongly.

Already, there are hundreds of homes due to be built on the old Sandoz site and this proposed new site will hugely add to the present problems we have with the heavy volume of traffic.Site 1202 is situated very close to this roundabout and the inevitable increase (at least 1 car per household) of traffic, pollution and noise is worrying.

The nearby school, Newlaithes Primary has recently been extended and is already full so further problems will occur with the rise in population.

A further 185 properties will affect the area badly and put further pressure on schools, shops and roads and remove forever the open green space that we all value and enjoy.Horsforth is becoming congested and overbuilt and over populated and I believe that Site 1202 is most unsuitable for housing

North Comments

Name: Haydn White

Representor No: PRS00882 **Representation ID:** REP02902

Question Ref: H4

1202 - Re the above, I am AGAINST the proposal on the basis of the information that has been provided. It is not good enough to say that the proposal "has issues", not to specify them and then to say that the Council "think it is suitable".

For the record, I would fully support the development, PROVIDING, the developer is obliged to facilitate:

- a)a GP health centre;
- b)an infant/primary school;
- c)appropriate traffic management systems;
- d)co-ordination with proposed additional rail network access to Leeds city centre; and
- e)provision for local shops.

All of the above are consistent with the powers that Leeds City Council holds and were placed on the statute book to enable Planning Authorities to insist on proper infrastructure provision.

I repeat, if Leeds City Council is minded simply to say "get building", I am AGAINST the proposal.

North Comments

Name: Jonathan White

Representor No: PRS01670 **Representation ID:** REP03824

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Concerned about Moseley Wood Lane being used as a rat run shortcut. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Concerned about Moseley Wood Lane, Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. School almost at capacity I am an ex.Governor. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Flooding has always been an issue, I have lived here 48 years and played there as a child. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Wildlife is clearly an issue.

North Comments

Name: Karen White

Representor No: PRS01677 **Representation ID:** REP03831

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Our street is already a rat run for through traffic and 200 more houses will make it even worse. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. The parking/traffic around the tesco store is already bad. The new estate will make it even worse. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The Schools are already over subscribed where are the children on the new estate going to go?. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. This is one of the few nature walks in the area without getting in the car. We need it to stay - peaceful area are important.

North Comments

Name: Catherine White

Representor No: PRS05641 **Representation ID:** REP06303

Question Ref: H7

I would like to express my agreement with the decision by Leeds City Council that the above sites are unsuitable for housing development. They are on the very edge of the city in a green field area with poor access, and border an area which I feel has already been intensively developed recently for housing.

North Comments

Name: Richard Whitfield

Representor No: PRS01173 Representation ID: REP03269

Question Ref: H7

2046 & 2160 - I see no reason why these sites should not be developed. They are well above the flood level; they will be used when/if the mooted rail link to the airport finally happens and could support many dwellings as long as the infrastructure is put in and Scotland Lane upgraded to accommodate the volume of traffic it already tries to support including fleets of taxis and articulated vehicles.

In addition, should the TASC site become available when the university does close, that would be a prime site as would the Gospel Hall site BUT certainly not the Whetstone Plantation which is ancient woodland and a facility of great value for the quality of life for the residents of the northern part of Horsforth, so often neglected by the Horsforth ward councillors on Leeds City Council and totally ignored by the organisation known as Horsforth Town Council.

North Comments

Name: Richard Whitfield

Representor No: PRS01173 Representation ID: REP03291

Question Ref: H7

2046 & 2160 - I see no reason why these sites should not be developed. They are well above the flood level; they will be used when/if the mooted rail link to the airport finally happens and could support many dwellings as long as the infrastructure is put in and Scotland Lane upgraded to accommodate the volume of traffic it already tries to support including fleets of taxis and articulated vehicles.

In addition, should the TASC site become available when the university does close, that would be a prime site as would the Gospel Hall site BUT certainly not the Whetstone Plantation which is ancient woodland and a facility of great value for the quality of life for the residents of the northern part of Horsforth, so often neglected by the Horsforth ward councillors on Leeds City Council and totally ignored by the organisation known as Horsforth Town Council.

North Comments

Name: James Whitfield

Representor No: PRS02295 Representation ID: REP04538

Question Ref: H1

1199 Moseley Bottom Green to Red. Strongly agree Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Agree the inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this. Railway line already floods. Field is bottom of a valley.

Strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. I go walking in this area all the time. This field is an excellent habitat for wildlife, and we must not lose this important natural green space.

North Comments

Name: Theresa Whittan

Representor No: PRS02197 **Representation ID:** REP04429

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Enough houses in the area for sale to provide any need. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Roads are narrow and busy at peak times. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. 2 primary schools are over subscribed/doctors surgery in area. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. The whole area is prone to flooding already, more hard landscaping will prove disatarous. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Lots of birds nesting, habitats for deer and other wildlife.

North Comments

Name: Christine Whittle

Representor No: PRS03006 **Representation ID:** REP05574

Question Ref: H4

Adjacent to the discussed railway line this site is a flood plain, the water draining from the rising Chevin. Difficult to get insurance on buildings in a flooded area. The access to this site is onto Old Pool Bank which is at best a very difficult road to negotiate as it is so narrow. At both ends of the Old Bank there is a main road. It simply is not suitable for development, being good agricultural land. The amenities in Pool-in Wharfedale village are poor. No bus service to Leeds or Bradford. No bank, no doctors surgery. The school is full to capacity already. Where do you expect the children to be educated. The pavements are dangerous and narrow. Bramhope School is full. Everything and everybody depends on getting about by car. Only two village shops. It is a planner disgrace wanting to expand a village beyond its capacity

Question Ref: H4

Site 2054 and 2053B should be considered for development by Leeds Council, because there are roads and a school with sufficient room. The bus services are good and regular. The school is conveniently placed for parents who take their children to school by car. There are shops and supermarkets

Question Ref: H4

The Tranco pipe line carrying high pressure gas across Wharfedale is a hazard. Why we should consider this field suitable for development is a far cry from the conservation Area created by Leeds City Council only years away. It is the gateway to the Dales with the Wharfe Valley being one of the most interesting. No employment in this parts and a poor bus service means that the people requiring work have to travel out of the village. Congestion is bad enough as it is with heavy lorries and tractors. The amenities in Pool-in Wharfedale village are poor. No bus service to Leeds or Bradford. No bank, no doctors surgery. The school is full to capacity already. Where do you expect the children to be educated. The pavements are dangerous and narrow. Bramhope School is full. Everything and everybody depends on getting about by car. Only two village shops. It is a planner disgrace wanting to expand a village beyond its capacity

Question Ref: H7

Site 2054 and 2053B should be considered for development by Leeds Council, because there are roads and a school with sufficient room. The bus services are good and regular. The school is conveniently placed for parents who take their children to school by car. There are shops and supermarkets

North Comments

Name: Pauline Wicking

Representor No: PRS01528 Representation ID: REP03669

Question Ref: H7

3034, 3327, 3328, 3330 - I do not agree with the proposal in respect of 300 properties to be built on the above four sites. West End Lane/Layton Road/Bayton Lane are already notorious for accidents and heavy traffic, especially at peak times.

I walk down West End Lane quite a lot and when cars are passing one another, as a pedestrian the vehicles are very close, because this road is so narrow, so how can this road expect to take more traffic. Also Layton Road is not as narrow, but certainly it is winding and narrowing towards Rawdon where it is already very restricted to get through the village. And the idea of the access and egress of the owners of 58 properties on Bayton Lane is beyond belief as this is an extremely dangerous and narrow road which is already well over used.

I strongly refute the idea of building any properties near the above roads because these narrow roads are NOT SUITABLE.

North Comments

Name: M Wigdafa

Representor No: PRS03007 Representation ID: REP05577

Question Ref: H1

Site 1178A Green (Assumed as 1178B is Red)

I would like to object to the council's designation of the above site which is currently green for the following reasons:

1.Increase in the volume of traffic on Long Causeway especially during rush hours.Long traffic queue is already a problem here and any further increase to this will only add to the chaos not to mention the atmospheric pollution caused by traffic jams.

2.Local amenities-our local gp surgery and the local schools are stretched to the limit in terms of capacity.Any further increase to their burden,especially to the gp surgery will cause untold misery to the adel community.

Due to a number of developments taking place in the Adel area on Brownfield sites i would suggest that the above site be put back towards the end of the plan post 2020.

North Comments

Name: Vivien Wigglesworth

Representor No: PRS01188 **Representation ID:** REP03286

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree. Cookridge cannot support increasing housing, transport & schools. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. The road are already busy and difficult pass parked cars without more traffic. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. Not enough facilities things like schools bus service health centre. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree. Many species like Bats deer seen in the area birds, wild flowers

North Comments

Name: Stephen Wigglesworth

Representor No: PRS02006 Representation ID: REP01009

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

This development is NOT wanted by local residents and is seen as an 'profit' before community project by Taylor Wimpey. The site is hillside sloping with poor access almost impossible to get in or out of in snow/winter conditions. Land drainage and severe flooding will become worse. Cookridge has not the Schools, roads or infrastructure to cope with the number of 'new' incomers - who will probably commute on already the busiest roads in Leeds. Natural open areas of wildlife ARE under increased threat from such developments.

Question Ref: H2

1151 reasons as stated above. Site 1151 SHOULD remain Red as it has difficult access and not suitable to build the number of planned units. Sites 3044 & 3360 Greenbelt land should remain as such.

Question Ref: H3

I do not agree with the coding of site 1151

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

1151 Green belt poor access narrow strip - very boggy.

Question Ref: General comment

Cookridge is not suitable for the number of planned houses - the community does not want further 'strain' on already over subsidised schools and doctors - the incomers will have to travel/commute to find work overloading the already busy main routes in & out. The TRAIN is full to capacity most rush hour times poor bus services especially in winter months..

North Comments

Name: Stephen Wigglesworth

Representor No: PRS02006 **Representation ID:** REP04199

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Coorkrdge as an area cannot be developed onno infrastructure to support houses not requird in green belt, build in brown belt. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Cookridge has poor access 3 main roads almost impossible to commut, snow bound in winter. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree.the area has no such servies. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. I have walked to route and seen the winter conditions in the area, have read the network rail report. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Unpoilt area geeenbelt noticable bat and wildlife habitats.

North Comments

Name: A.c Wightman

Representor No: PRS05149 **Representation ID:** REP05725

Question Ref: H7

1015 - agree

I would like to express agreement with the classification of this area as unsuitable for development. The road system in the locality is wholly unsuited to further residential development and the effect on traffic numbers in the vicinity of the Primary School on West End Lane would be a source of great danger. This area is already congested for much of the day by school and nursery traffic.

North Comments

Name: K Wigin

Representor No: PRS01970 **Representation ID:** REP04160

Question Ref: H1

1299A - BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: K Wiggin

Representor No: PRS01970 Representation ID: REP04160

Question Ref: H1

1178A -

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed.

NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt.. inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless "very special circumstances" exist. However, the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83

"...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt.. to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A - which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of *Britton v SOS*, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable

North Comments

Name: K Wigin

Representor No: PRS01970 Representation ID: REP04160

housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 - Protected Playing Pitch

B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites - for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site 1178A objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorksire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear, defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network - tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space
- it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents
- destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" - it will involve destruction of Green Belt and increased congestion and pollution from the vehicles of new residents and the only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s)

NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used: (i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria.., locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement 12 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network"

NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties"

Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of

North Comments

Name: K Wigin

Representor No: PRS01970 Representation ID: REP04160

5 for the congestion impact on the local network - tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

iv

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places"

NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions

CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided..., then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity

In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Question Ref: H4

2130 - CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: K Wigin

Representor No: PRS01970 **Representation ID:** REP04160

Question Ref: H7

1299B - BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquills, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 - TILE LANE

Question Ref: General comment

[written comments]

No account seems to have been taken of the over all increase in traffic from all these proposed developments. The traffic on the Ring Road and the Otley Road is already unsustainable as is the access from Adel Lane.

North Comments

Name: Hilary Wild

Representor No: PRS05519 Representation ID: REP06716

Question Ref: H7

Dear Sirs

I understand that the site numbered 1015 "Hunger Hills and land south of Lee Lane West" is listed as not suitable for the allocation of housing.

I am, therefore, writing to let you know that I completely agree with the classification of this site. I consider that the site is unsuitable for housing as there is very poor road access via a narrow winding and very busy country lane. The site is also used recreationally and building would deprive local residents of access to woods and fields.

North Comments

Name: Bethan Wilkin

Representor No: PRS01870 **Representation ID:** REP04043

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. It is already well developed and has more than sufficient housing. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. More through traffic, parking problems, more cars on the road. The streets are busy enough! Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. Local schools and nurseries/doctors etc cannot cope with more demand. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. More flooding problems. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Don't disrupt the wildlife.

North Comments

Name: Steve Wilks

Representor No: PRS05721 Representation ID: REP06376

Question Ref: H7

With reference to the proposed building plots 1014 and 1016 I am sending this e-mail on behalf of my mother, who still lives in the family home at 2, Calverley Lane where we have lived since 1976. Before this my immediate family was born and raised in Horsforth at Rose Avenue and the family does go back for 2 generations in Horsforth. My grandparents and great grandparents are all buried in the cemetery at the bottom of Calverley lane – which also raises a concern for us about the proposed building plans 731 and 1202 which will effectively surround the cemetery with housing.

My mother – Margaret Wilks – is now 84 and has witnessed over her life time the disappearance of much of the countryside in and around Horsforth under housing developments. Even I can remember walking to St. Margarets church along a country lane – long gone now as the whole area is a large housing estate.

As an existing resident of Horsforth and being directly affected by all of the proposed plots, Mrs. Wilks strongly objects to the proposals, especially on the principle that enough green space has already been lost to housing and surely this must stop. Furthermore on the practical level, there is already serious congestion around the ring road and roundabout in the centre of these proposals and the plans will only add to this. The road systems and available schooling and amenities are already barely sufficient to cope with the existing population – how can we sustain more?

So please take this e-mail as an objection to the proposed plans for sites 731, 1202, 1014 and 1016.

North Comments

Name: Margaret Wilks

Representor No: PRS05724 Representation ID: REP06393

Question Ref: H4

Please take this e-mail as an objection to the proposed plans for sites 731, 1202, 1014 and 1016.

I am sending this e-mail on behalf of my mother, who still lives in the family home at 2, Calverley Lane where we have lived since 1976. Before this my immediate family was born and raised in Horsforth at Rose Avenue and the family does go back for 2 generations in Horsforth. My grandparents and great grandparents are all buried in the cemetery at the bottom of Calverley lane – which also raises a concern for us about the proposed building plans 731 and 1202 which will effectively surround the cemetery with housing.

My mother – Margaret Wilks – is now 84 and has witnessed over her life time the disappearance of much of the countryside in and around Horsforth under housing developments. Even I can remember walking to St. Margarets church along a country lane – long gone now as the whole area is a large housing estate.

As an existing resident of Horsforth and being directly affected by all of the proposed plots, Mrs. Wilks strongly objects to the proposals, especially on the principle that enough green space has already been lost to housing and surely this must stop. Furthermore on the practical level, there is already serious congestion around the ring road and roundabout in the centre of these proposals and the plans will only add to this. The road systems and available schooling and amenities are already barely sufficient to cope with the existing population – how can we sustain more?

North Comments

Name: Judith Williams

Representor No: PRS01617 Representation ID: REP03768

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments- Strongly agree. The present infrastructure is not enough to cope with the influx. Why not build on brownfield sites? Here are more than enough in Leeds

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem- Strongly agree.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly Agree.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this- Strongly agree. With new housing and probably very small green space/gardens where will all the rainfall go?

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree. There little enough areas for wildlife without removing this important corridor

North Comments

Name: Elizabrth Williams

Representor No: PRS02361 **Representation ID:** REP04615

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Unsure The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Unsure I do not live in Cookridge so am unsure about this Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Unsure Again unsure about this

North Comments

Name: Karen Williams

Representor No: PRS02396 **Representation ID:** REP04653

Question Ref: G17

I feel this space should be kept as Green Space.

North Comments

Name: C Williams

Representor No: PRS02539 Representation ID: REP04829

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: C Williams

Representor No: PRS02539 Representation ID: REP04829

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: C Williams

Representor No: PRS02539 Representation ID: REP04829

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: C Williams

Representor No: PRS02539 Representation ID: REP04829

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: C Williams

Representor No: PRS02539 Representation ID: REP04829

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in not way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: C Williams

Representor No: PRS02539 Representation ID: REP04829

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 — LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: S Williams

Representor No: PRS02858 Representation ID: REP05411

Question Ref: H7

Yes I agree

North Comments

Name: Paul Williams

Representor No: PRS03810 Representation ID: REP00846

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Reference Site : 1079 Outer North West This is a mature greenfield site with mature trees and very close to the 1000 year old Adel Church. The church is designated as a Grade I historical building and one of the oldest churches in Yorkshire. In addition, Site 1079 is also bounded on the Eastern side by the 'Long Causeway' which is an ancient pathway of special historical interest with a pathway made of ancient stones. The 1079 site is only accessed via a narrow road (the Long Causeway road) which is totally unsuitable to the large amount of traffic that would be generated by a housing development. The road is also crossed by children who attend the Adel St John the Baptist Primary School which would create a hazard for the children if additional housing traffic used the road. Therefore I fully support the Council in designating site 1079 in Outer North West as a 'RED' site, unsuitable for housing.

North Comments

Name: Andy Williams

Representor No: PRS05583 **Representation ID:** REP06237

Question Ref: H7

May I concur that the two sites 2160 and 2046 are absolutely not suitable for housing.

Building here would destroy the integrity of the edge of the green belt and the edge of Horsforth and it is essential that these areas are not built upon.

North Comments

Name: Roger & Sue Williams

Representor No: PRS06068 Representation ID: REP06915

Question Ref: H7

1079, 1243, 1246 - supports red

The Respondents fully support the decision of Leeds City Council to identify sites ref. 1079, 1243 and 1246 as 'red sites' within its 'traffic light' system, and to conclude that none are considered suitable as potential housing allocations. However, for the reasons set out in the above appraisal, it is considered that in addressing and balancing the various issues, insufficient weight has been placed on a number of factors, notably:

- the difficulties that are inherent in considering the possibility of mitigation measures to address the disadvantages of the sites in terms of their relationships with public transport services and other key facilities:

- the harm that allocations would cause in terms of the purposes of the Green Belt, and to its key characteristics of openness and permanence
- the significant harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (a designated heritage asset) as a result of (a) development primarily within its very recently extended boundary (b) the need to remove extensive lengths of walls and trees in order to provide a satisfactory access, and (c) the resultant harm that would be caused to the historic pavement adjacent to Long Causeway.
- the significant harm that would be caused to the setting of the Church of St John the Baptist (a Grade 1 listed building) and the interruption of key views of the church from within the Conservation Area; and
- the significant harm that would be caused to the designated Urban Green Corridor, both as a result of its reduction in size following development within it and as a result of the loss of a green lung extending into the urban area from the wider countryside.

In such circumstances, the Council is asked (a) to conclude that the allocation of any or all of the site in question would cause significant harm, contrary to national and local policy guidance (b) to retain the 'red' designation as currently applied to each of the sites and to resist any suggestion that they should be considered as suitable potential housing allocations. Should any further re-appraisal be required, or should the existing assessments be reviewed, the Council is asked to have regard to the issues raised in this submission, and to maintain its current position.

For further comments/information, see full representation.

North Comments

Name: Katie Willis

Representor No: PRS01954 **Representation ID:** REP04137

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Agree. Need better road access if this to happen especially towards Kirkstall. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Unsure. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Agree.

North Comments

Name: Ian Willoughby

Representor No: PRS05036 **Representation ID:** REP05602

Question Ref: H7

I support the initial proposal to refuse applications of further building on Hunger Hills and surrounding areas. I urge you to confirm the decision that this site is unsuitable for development. The site is important for nature, birds, mammals, trees, plants, invertebrates etc.

As with all natural areas it is important to people. It is well documents that all people benefit from frequent contact with green areas especially this site, the vulnerable and children. The children at two nearby schools perform better because of the fields and trees. I personally benefit regular walks in these areas. Please protect this area for nature and people.

North Comments

Name: Karen Willows

Representor No: PRS01533 **Representation ID:** REP03674

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as Dentists & Health Centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding More build will affect this Strongly agree. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Sarah Wilson

Representor No: PRS01239 **Representation ID:** REP03344

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Traffic is already a terrible problem

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree.

The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree.

Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Nf Wilson

Representor No: PRS01316 Representation ID: REP03426

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. Moseley Beck subject to being swollen in heavy rain as witnessed over the years. Therefore unsuitable for building. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Traffic lights would be a help on green lane now! Without further building! Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. As on the previous page. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: C Wilson

Representor No: PRS01715 Representation ID: REP03863

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site 1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: C Wilson

Representor No: PRS01715 Representation ID: REP03863

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: C Wilson

Representor No: PRS01715 Representation ID: REP03863

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: C Wilson

Representor No: PRS01715 Representation ID: REP03863

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: C Wilson

Representor No: PRS01715 Representation ID: REP03863

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: C Wilson

Representor No: PRS01715 Representation ID: REP03863

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: P Wilson

Representor No: PRS01729 Representation ID: REP03876

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: P Wilson

Representor No: PRS01729 Representation ID: REP03876

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: P Wilson

Representor No: PRS01729 Representation ID: REP03876

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: P Wilson

Representor No: PRS01729 Representation ID: REP03876

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: P Wilson

Representor No: PRS01729 Representation ID: REP03876

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: P Wilson

Representor No: PRS01729 **Representation ID:** REP03876

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites

North Comments

Name: Peter Wilson

Representor No: PRS01814 **Representation ID:** REP03977

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Agree. I don't want the quiet cul-de-sac of Cookridge Drive to become the main cross road to a near housing estate. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Traffic crossing the railway already a problem. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Unsure. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Unsure.

North Comments

Name: B Wilson

Representor No: PRS01924 Representation ID: REP04103

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: B Wilson

Representor No: PRS01924 Representation ID: REP04103

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: B Wilson

Representor No: PRS01924 Representation ID: REP04103

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquilts, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: B Wilson

Representor No: PRS01924 Representation ID: REP04103

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: B Wilson

Representor No: PRS01924 Representation ID: REP04103

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in not way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

North Comments

Name: B Wilson

Representor No: PRS01924 Representation ID: REP04103

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

North Comments

Name: David Wilson

Representor No: PRS02080 **Representation ID:** REP04296

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree The road infrastructure can not cope the Doctors are oversubscribed as are the schools The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Currently traffic using Green Lane there are long delays on a morning Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree Holy Trinity Primary School currently has a waiting list so children will have to go outside the area causing more traffic at school time The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree The area is often problematic when it rains. Buildings will cause flooding also problems with flooding on the railway line Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat When walking in the area you can see lots of wildlife including Deer & Foxes these will be destroyed.

North Comments

Name: Judith Wilson

Representor No: PRS02083 **Representation ID:** REP04297

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments Strongly agree I have lived in Cookridge all my life, there are sufficient houses in the area with often homes having 2 cars if the houses were built there would be an increase in traffic which would cause danger to children playing out. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree With all streets being used as 'Rat Runs' at the moment. Increase in traffic will cause problems and trying to exit from Green Lane onto Tinshill Road will cause problems. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree Our children and now our grandchildren all go to local facilities. I object to them having to attend schools etc out of area- That's why we moved here to access all facilities. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley Wood bottom is very boggy - I walk there regularly and often the ground is saturated. Houses will cause increased problems in this area. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Over the 40+ years I have lived in Cookridge I have seen various wildlife in that area - Deer Foxes etc if the development took place where would these animals live!!.

North Comments

Name: Aimee Wilson

Representor No: PRS02220 **Representation ID:** REP04454

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Any one in their right of mind would not agree with this extra traffic on green lane. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Read other side of this form. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: C H Wilson

Representor No: PRS02962 Representation ID: REP06987

Question Ref: H1

Sites Numbered 3329, 3331 and 4095

We are specifically concerned with the proposed categorisation of the Sites.

In the first instance, our understanding of Green Belt land is as set out in National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) of March 2012.

1. The policy on protection for the Green Belt is contained in section 9 of the NPPF, which sets out the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy:
2. The NPPF also makes clear that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as "inappropriate" for the Green Belt, although there are exceptions:-

We fully appreciate that some housing development is necessary and the Government has made that very clear with the promotion of George Osborne's "Help to Buy" Scheme announcement this week that more homes must be built to buy, but this should not be to the detriment of Green Belt which, subject to the Exceptions set out above, the Government has said it will protect.

We do not believe that the Sites fall within the Exceptions set out in the NPPF because this Consultation is about housing only and not any type of development whatsoever.

The sites in Rawdon we are concerned about are presently designated GREEN BELT. There are not "Brownfield" sites (Naylor Jennings Mill on Green Lane, Rawdon) and they are not even "Greenfield"; they are clearly designated GREEN BELT to protect them.

Even if there were some argument about "infilling" it is in the first instance "limited" and there has to be a full debate as to what the word "limited" actually means in the context of an existing neighbourhood; How is "limited" calculated? Is it defined? How? Once the Green Belt has been built upon it ceases to exist. It is important to retain the Sites as Green Belt to preserve Rawdon from urban sprawl. If the actual size of Rawdon village is considered, the area of the Sites, if developed as housing, would be disproportionate to the village. This cannot be said to be "limited infilling" because building 175 houses would be totally disproportionate in the context of the current size of the historic community of Rawdon and cannot therefore be an Exception as envisaged by the NPPF.

Our main concerns focus on the development of these Green Belt areas but we stress that the general presumption is against inappropriate development, unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated to show that the benefits of housing development will outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt. We do not believe that "special circumstances" can be demonstrated that could outweigh the need to retain the Sites as Green Belt.

In addition, we strongly object that the Sites are suitable for allocation for housing on the following grounds:-

1. The areas, while proximate to the A65, will create a significant and unacceptable increase in the amount of traffic on the main road into Leeds. When the "Rawdon Billing Action Group" submitted a report to Leeds City Council in 2012, they set out in that report all of the statistics relating to the road and its use and the volume of traffic on that road already. The Council has that report on record and we ask that the figures as set out in that report are revisited to demonstrate the current over use and congestion on that road which cannot sustain further vehicles which would access it if further housing development took place on the Sites;
2. The A65 is also the only route for buses into Leeds City centre and there would be no possibility to improve further congestion that housing development of the Sites would create;
3. The nearest railway station is Horsforth and there are already parking issues there. "Residents Only" parking restricted zones have been in place for many years around the railway station because of its overuse. The car park is tiny, hence the current unsustainable overflow. Cars park as far away as the cricket ground on Brownberrie Lane and walk down to the station;
4. Additional cars from houses built on the Sites will cause further congestion and overcrowding in that area;
5. Housing development of other areas further along the A65 towards Guiseley and Menston and development of the Clarion site will also add to the current vehicular congestion of the A65, making development of the Sites even less sustainable;
6. Additional vehicles from development of the Sites will also create further congestion and danger to pedestrians and road users alike of Layton Road and Rawdon village itself. Only last year, Leeds City Council proposed a road calming scheme within the boundaries of Rawdon as it had been long recognized that the village has vehicles driving at speed and using it as a "rat run" from other areas further west of Leeds City centre. These calming measures are a waste of time if further development is to be permitted on the Sites as it must be obvious that additional use of Layton Lane and Layton Road will simply fly in the face of the proposals in the calming measures suggested by the Council;
7. There are inadequate schools, doctors, shops, community facilities etc for an additional 175 houses. Is a whole new village proposed to support 175 additional houses?;
8. The Sites, particularly Red Beck and Gill Beck, are used every day for recreational purposes, dog walking, running, children playing etc. It would be detrimental to the woodland along the Beck and the wildlife that uses this area as its natural habitat for housing to be built on it. Such overuse of the land would inevitable cause an erosion of the current natural environment and the benefit of the existing users of the Sites, particularly Red Beck/ Green Beck site 3329. ("Site 33291");
9. Development of the Site 3329 will take Rawdon boundary right up to the boundary with Horsforth, the complete antithesis of the position set out in the NPPF, being the clear need to protect against "urban sprawl", one of the major tenets of Green Belt land. It is not a sufficient argument to suggest that there would only be limited affect on Green Belt if this area were developed, as such development would clearly be urban sprawl;
10. There is evidence of Coal Mining in the area surrounding the Sites. Along Layton Lane one house has a mine marked as "Zone of Interest" ("ZOI") which means that the Coal Authority believe that they need to undertake surveys to determine whether the mine is safe and if not, what works are required to render it safe. The shafts relating to that mine cannot be identified by the Coal Authority and their location is therefore not traceable — how does this sit with development of Site 3329 for housing if shafts are not traceable? Surely that renders the Site unsafe for human

North Comments

Name: C H Wilson

Representor No: PRS02962 **Representation ID:** REP06987

habitation? There are also mines marked "ZOI" in the fields to the East of Site 3329 — the tunnels and shafts relating to these mines are also untraceable on the Coal Authority's records — is Site 3329 really developable?

Question Ref: H7

We are delighted to see that The Billing (site 32) has been designated as "red" and not suitable for development.

Assume 3034

North Comments

Name: Billy Wilson

Representor No: PRS04400 Representation ID: REP01548

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I can understand most of the reasons put forward for the use of the green sites. These involve quite a lot of green belt, but in my opinion they are closer to Leeds and as such would not add to the traffic congestion until we get further down the A65

Question Ref: H3

2038 is coded amber, but is Brownfield. The fact that it would require remedial works before a residential use could be considered should not make so much difference. Surely the profit margins of the builders aren't the issue here. Brownfield should be considered before any scrap of greenbelt is used. After all Brownfield has already been developed, but once built on you will never get green belt back.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious

Question Ref: H6

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H8

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H9

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

North Comments

Name: Billy Wilson

Representor No: PRS04400 **Representation ID:** REP01548

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area. I have submitted them as my own, as I agree with them entirely. [x]

North Comments

Name: Susan Wilson

Representor No: PRS05741 Representation ID: REP06411

Question Ref: H7

Site 1015; Hungerhills and land south of Lee Lane West.

I wish to state that I agree with the classification of the above site as NOT suitable for housing.

This land is an attractive open space with far reaching views, it abuts Hunger hills woods and is enjoyed by walkers. Access would create traffic problems as West End Lane is narrow and windy. Also Lee Lane West is a quiet residential road.

There are enough new houses going up in Horsforth as it is eg Sandos site and the schools and doctors' surgeries are full to capacity as it is.

North Comments

Name: George Wilson

Representor No: PRS05897 **Representation ID:** REP06647

Question Ref: H7

I wish to confirm my agreement with the classification of the above site as unsuitable for housing. As an open space it has greater value, and is a much needed environmental asset. The local infrastructure in terms of transport, education and medical provision do not have the capacity to cope with an increase in demand.

North Comments

Name: Chris And Alison Wilson

Representor No: PRS06084 Representation ID: REP06932

Question Ref: H1

Re: Leeds City Council's draft Site Allocation Plan 2013
Sites Numbered 3329, 3331 and 4095 in particular (the "Sites")

We refer to the draft Site Allocation Plan published by Leeds City Council on 3rd June this year.

We understand that the time limit allowing public response to the consultation closes on 29th July 2013.

We are specifically concerned with the proposed categorisation of the Sites.

We are delighted to see that The Billing (site 32) has been designated as "red" and not suitable for development.

In the first instance, our understanding of Green Belt land is as set out in National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) of March 2012.

The main points in the NPPF which we feel are relevant for the purposes of the Sites we are concerned with are as follows:-

1. The policy on protection for the Green Belt is contained in section 9 of the NPPF, which sets out the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy:

" The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. "

2. The NPPF also makes clear that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as "inappropriate" for the Green Belt, although there are exceptions:-

" A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:-

- buildings for agriculture and forestry;
-
- provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
-
- the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
-
- the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
-
- limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or
-
- limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. "

We fully appreciate that some housing development is necessary and the Government has made that very clear with the promotion of George Osborne's "Help to Buy" Scheme announcement this week that more homes must be built to buy, but this should not be to the detriment of Green Belt which, subject to the Exceptions set out above, the Government has said it will protect.

We do not believe that the Sites fall within the Exceptions set out in the NPPF because this Consultation is about housing only and not any type of development whatsoever.

Without question, the NPPF states that there are 5 stated purposes of including and therefore retaining land within the Green Belt and these are well known:-

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

Once an area of land has been defined as green belt, the stated opportunities and benefits include:-

1. "Providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population;
2. Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas;
3. The retention of attractive landscapes and the enhancement of landscapes, near to where people live;
4. Improvement of damaged and derelict land around towns;
5. The securing of nature conservation interests;

North Comments

Name: Chris And Alison Wilson

Representor No: PRS06084 Representation ID: REP06932

6.The retention of land in agricultural, forestry and related uses."

The sites in Rawdon we are concerned about are presently designated GREEN BELT. There are not "Brownfield" sites (Naylor Jennings Mill on Green Lane, Rawdon) and they are not even "Greenfield"; they are clearly designated GREEN BELT to protect them.

Even if there were some argument about "infilling" it is in the first instance "limited" and there has to be a full debate as to what the word "limited" actually means in the context of an existing neighbourhood; How is "limited" calculated? Is it defined? How? Once the Green Belt has been built upon it ceases to exist. It is important to retain the Sites as Green Belt to preserve Rawdon from urban sprawl. If the actual size of Rawdon village is considered, the area of the Sites, if developed as housing, would be disproportionate to the village. This cannot be said to be "limited infilling" because building 175 houses would be totally disproportionate in the context of the current size of the historic community of Rawdon and cannot therefore be an Exception as envisaged by the NPPF.

Our main concerns focus on the development of these Green Belt areas but we stress that the general presumption is against inappropriate development, unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated to show that the benefits of housing development will outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt. We do not believe that "special circumstances" can be demonstrated that could outweigh the need to retain the Sites as Green Belt.

In addition, we strongly object that the Sites are suitable for allocation for housing on the following grounds:-

1.The areas, while proximate to the A65, will create a significant and unacceptable increase in the amount of traffic on the main road into Leeds. When the "Rawdon Billing Action Group" submitted a report to Leeds City Council in 2012, they set out in that report all of the statistics relating to the road and its use and the volume of traffic on that road already. The Council has that report on record and we ask that the figures as set out in that report are revisited to demonstrate the current over use and congestion on that road which cannot sustain further vehicles which would access it if further housing development took place on the Sites;

2.The A65 is also the only route for buses into Leeds City centre and there would be no possibility to improve further congestion that housing development of the Sites would create;

3.The nearest railway station is Horsforth and there are already parking issues there. "Residents Only" parking restricted zones have been in place for many years around the railway station because of its overuse. The car park is tiny, hence the current unsustainable overflow. Cars park as far away as the cricket ground on Brownberrie Lane and walk down to the station;

4.Additional cars from houses built on the Sites will cause further congestion and overcrowding in that area;

5. Housing development of other areas further along the A65 towards Guiseley and Menston and development of the Clarion site will also add to the current vehicular congestion of the A65, making development of the Sites even less sustainable;

6.Additional vehicles from development of the Sites will also create further congestion and danger to pedestrians and road users alike of Layton Road and Rawdon village itself. Only last year, Leeds City Council proposed a road calming scheme within the boundaries of Rawdon as it had been long recognized that the village has vehicles driving at speed and using it as a "rat run" from other areas further west of Leeds City centre. These calming measures are a waste of time if further development is to be permitted on the Sites as it must be obvious that additional use of Layton Lane and Layton Road will simply fly in the face of the proposals in the calming measures suggested by the Council;

7.There are inadequate schools, doctors, shops, community facilities etc for an additional 175 houses. Is a whole new village proposed to support 175 additional houses?;

8.The Sites, particularly Red Beck and Gill Beck, are used every day for recreational purposes, dog walking, running, children playing etc. It would be detrimental to the woodland along the Beck and the wildlife that uses this area as its natural habitat for housing to be built on it. Such overuse of the land would inevitable cause an erosion of the current natural environment and the benefit of the existing users of the Sites, particularly Red Beck/ Green Beck site 3329. ("Site 3329");

9.Development of the Site 3329 will take Rawdon boundary right up to the boundary with Horsforth, the complete antithesis of the position set out in the NPPF, being the clear need to protect against "urban sprawl", one of the major tenets of Green Belt land. It is not a sufficient argument to suggest that there would only be limited affect on Green Belt if this area were developed, as such development would clearly be urban sprawl;

10.There is evidence of Coal Mining in the area surrounding the Sites. Along Layton Lane one house has a mine marked as "Zone of Interest" ("ZOI") which means that the Coal Authority believe that they need to undertake surveys to determine whether the mine is safe and if not, what works are required to render it safe. The shafts relating to that mine cannot be identified by the Coal Authority and their location is therefore not traceable – how does this sit with development of Site 3329 for housing if shafts are not traceable? Surely that renders the Site unsafe for human habitation? There are also mines marked "ZOI" in the fields to the East of Site 3329 – the tunnels and shafts relating to these mines are also untraceable on the Coal Authority's records – is Site 3329 really developable?

In conclusion, we object strongly to the removal of the Sites from the Green Belt as we do not feel that there are sufficient grounds for the land to fall within the Exceptions set out in the NPPF. There are , however, sufficient grounds to demonstrate that the Sites remain as protection for Rawdon against urban sprawl and to safeguard the surrounding countryside from further encroachment. Rawdon is a very small historic community in the context of other areas within the control of Leeds City Council and its location within an already heavily congested and developed area means that further housing development of the Sites, which are located in Green Belt, cannot be considered before areas where the sites are Brownfield and Greenfield and where the transport issues are far less difficult and can withstand and support further development without so many ensuing problems, such as the Clarion site and the Naylor Jennings site.

Question Ref: H7

We are delighted to see that The Billing (site 32) has been designated as "red" and not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Claire Wilson-sharp

Representor No: PRS01373 **Representation ID:** REP03497

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: Claire Wilson-sharp

Representor No: PRS01373 Representation ID: REP03497

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Claire Wilson-sharp

Representor No: PRS01373 Representation ID: REP03497

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: Claire Wilson-sharp

Representor No: PRS01373 **Representation ID:** REP03497

Question Ref: H4

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Claire Wilson-sharp

Representor No: PRS01373 Representation ID: REP03497

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: Claire Wilson-sharp

Representor No: PRS01373 Representation ID: REP03497

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: Claire Wilson-sharp

Representor No: PRS01373 **Representation ID:** REP03497

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites

North Comments

Name: Mia Windgren

Representor No: PRS02335 **Representation ID:** REP04587

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Ronald Witham

Representor No: PRS04200 Representation ID: REP01223

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

To a certain extent. Most are green belt but are closer to Leeds than the amber sites of 3026 and 4043. Green belt should be preserved at all costs. Guiseley has 953 of the 1105 dwellings allocated to Aireborough at 31.3.12.

Question Ref: H3

2038 is Brownfield and should always be considered first. It is nearer Leeds and would be less congestive to Guiseley's bit of A65.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of these sites are green belt

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12., then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Quite a number of these red sites are green belt just the same as the amber sites. I believe most of the criteria used to exclude some of the red sites could also be applied to the amber ones.

Question Ref: H9

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12., then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area. I have submitted them as my own, and agree with them entirely.

North Comments

Name: Margaret Witham

Representor No: PRS04408 **Representation ID:** REP01225

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

To a certain extent. Most are green belt but are closer to Leeds than the amber sites of 3026 and 4043. Green belt should be preserved at all costs. Guiseley has 953 of the 1105 dwellings allocated to Aireborough at 31.3.12.

Question Ref: H3

2038 is Brownfield and should always be considered first. It is nearer Leeds and would be less congestive to Guiseley's bit of A65.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of these sites are green belt.

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12., then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Quite a number of these red sites are green belt just the same as the amber sites. I believe most of the criteria used to exclude some of the red sites could also be applied to the amber ones.

Question Ref: H9

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12., then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area. I have submitted them as my own, and agree with them entirely.

North Comments

Name: Lucy Woffenden

Representor No: PRS01579 **Representation ID:** REP03728

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments- Agree.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem- Strongly agree.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Strongly Agree.

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this- Agree.

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Lucy Woffenden

Representor No: PRS01579 **Representation ID:** REP04752

Question Ref: H1

1199 – Moseley Bottom, Green to Red. Strongly agree Cookridge needs no more housing developments.

Strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Our roads cannot take the increased volume of traffic that this development would bring.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. How can the area possibly accommodate this? Schools in Cookridge are over subscribed as are feeder high schools.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. This will impact the Harrogate to Horsforth train line which would cause chaos to commuters.

Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat. This will impact the wildlife in the area and will kill a great deal.

North Comments

Name: Mark Woffenden

Representor No: PRS02483 Representation ID: REP04750

Question Ref: H1

1199 – Moseley Bottom, Green to Red. Strongly agree Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Unnecessary resulting in huge problems.

Strongly agree the inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Also only 1 entrance to this proposed estate is ridiculous which means a Cookridge Drive exit will be inevitable.

Strongly agree local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand.

Strongly agree the area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this.

Strongly agree Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

North Comments

Name: Jayne Woodale

Representor No: PRS00090 **Representation ID:** REP00496

Question Ref: H4

1202 - I oppose the proposed site, 1202 ' land off Victoria Ave' to develop another housing estate for 185 houses. - Where will the access roads be?- Do you propose building more schools?- Where will all the extra families go for medical attention?Come to Horsforth when the children are coming home from school. There are 4 roads converge at the school. Cars are parked in every street. It's a miracle that some children haven't had serious accidents. It seems permission has already been given (site 731) for 15 properties. I wonder who gave permission I feel we are now at saturation point, will soon have no green fields left in Horsforth. As Eric Pickles has already given permission for properties on the old Clarian site. Can you imagine the traffic congestion when those houses have been built, let alone if you build even more?May I have a reply to all my questions please?

North Comments

Name: Michael Woodall

Representor No: PRS01479 Representation ID: REP03615

Question Ref: H4

1095B and 1369

The large number of proposed houses would result in a vastly increased traffic pressure on local roads, ie Pool Main Street (and conservation area) Old Pool Bank, and the A659 and the A660 as due to a local lack of shops, school places and employment, commuting for work and services would be unavoidable. This would result in greatly increased car use due to a lack of public transport, on already overcrowded roads. The sites chosen for these developments are unsuitable due to their geographic position. Site 1095A is next to the river and floods. The other two sites are situated below the Chevin ridge and large amounts of drainage water collects in them. So they are boggy and prone to floods. This discounts the loss of (a) greenbelt space, (b) valuable agricultural land.

Question Ref: H7

2054 and 2053A

Alternatively, the Alwoodly sites above listed have the advantage of better larger surrounding roads and are nearer local facilities like schools, shops, leisure facilities and relate to existing housing and outward expansion along the A61. These areas should NOT therefore be designated red regarding development.

Question Ref: H7

1095A

The large number of proposed houses would result in a vastly increased traffic pressure on local roads, ie Pool Main Street (and conservation area) Old Pool Bank, and the A659 and the A660 as due to a local lack of shops, school places and employment, commuting for work and services would be unavoidable. This would result in greatly increased car use due to a lack of public transport, on already overcrowded roads. The sites chosen for these developments are unsuitable due to their geographic position. Site 1095A is next to the river and floods. The other two sites are situated below the Chevin ridge and large amounts of drainage water collects in them. So they are boggy and prone to floods. This discounts the loss of (a) greenbelt space, (b) valuable agricultural land.

North Comments

Name: Margaret Woodall

Representor No: PRS01480 Representation ID: REP03616

Question Ref: H4

1095B and 1369

Vast increase in traffic in the local area.

Streets/roads are already overcrowded and very narrow.

Near river which floods.

Boggy land prone to floodings.

Loss of green belt space and agricultural land.

These areas are not suitable for development, should be designated red.

Question Ref: H7

2054 and 2053A

Alwoodley site has better/larger surrounding roads and also many more local amenities.

Question Ref: H7

1095A

Vast increase in traffic in the local area.

Streets/roads are already overcrowded and very narrow.

Near river which floods.

Boggy land prone to floodings.

Loss of green belt space and agricultural land.

North Comments

Name: Jean Wood

Representor No: PRS00095 **Representation ID:** REP00501

Question Ref: H7

1310 - The approach's exit into Outwood Lane is on a very bad corner. There are more sites suitable where it is more convenient for all concerned.

North Comments

Name: Christine Wood

Representor No: PRS00865 **Representation ID:** REP02883

Question Ref: H1

1199 - No - See the next question for the main reasons.

Question Ref: H2

1199 - Comments

- A housing development will generate a substantial amount of extra traffic.
- We do not have the infrastructure to cope with the extra traffic.
- Moseley Wood Gardens has a concrete base. A cosmetic layer of tarmac is periodically applied. Extra traffic will have an impact. Streets will require constant attention. Heavy plant used during site construction will create further damage to the concrete base.
- Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times. That situation will worsen substantially with the new development.
- Commuters from Harrogate, Otley and outlying areas use Bramhope village and Cookridge as a through route. Additional local traffic from a new estate will add to the problems.
- The development will be situated at the lowest point in Cookridge. Traffic from a new development will add substantially to the winter chaos. Roads are rarely gritted making it extremely difficult to access and exit Cookridge in winter months.
- The area will attract less people with the increased difficulties in navigating to and from Cookridge.
- The development will impact on the local schools. School places will become an issue.
- Parking is problematic and dangerous outside of the local school, Tesco and Post Office. Road safety is of prime concern. The problems will worsen with a new development. Residents are severely affected by the current situation.
- The train service is questionable. A minimum number of carriages are provided at peak times. Parking at Horsforth Station is totally inadequate for local people. Commuters travel by car from outside Leeds, park their cars on the streets around the station, and use the local train. Extra housing will compound the problems.
- There is concern over the inadequacy of the current public transport system in the area and there is poor connectivity to a number of locations in the city. As a result of this issue and a number of others this development would neither be environmentally or socially sustainable.
- Flooding may become a problem to the railway line from surface run off, causing delays.
- The countryside adjacent to Cookridge will be destroyed along with the ecology.

North Comments

Name: I.m. Wood

Representor No: PRS01298 **Representation ID:** REP03405

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments - agree. Cookridge can only take a limited amount of extra housing

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. The north-west of Leeds already has a major traffic problem and access to the new site will make the local traffic intolerable

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand- Agree

The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding, More building will affect this - Agree

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Doreen Wood

Representor No: PRS01306 Representation ID: REP03414

Question Ref: H1

I have been informed that this field is being considered as building land for 25 houses.

Some 30 years ago it was planned to build a school there but the building did not take place because the ground was water-logged by underground springs. In addition, access to the site could be difficult except through the burial ground of the church.

For these reasons I suggest that this site is not suitable for housing.

North Comments

Name: Laura Wood

Representor No: PRS04464 **Representation ID:** REP00118

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

They are in the main small areas that are surrounded by existing housing and have ready road access / facilities nearby. However I think that areas which have already been given the go ahead for development (such as Kirkstall Forge) should be developed first and that brown field sites / restoration of existing derelict buildings should be completed first before consideration of losing any further green areas.

Question Ref: H2

1202 should not be built on. This is the only large open playing area with easy access for local children. It is opposite Newlaithes Primary school and is extremely well used by the children of the local area. It's loss would be a terrible blow to the area.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

They are open areas that are important to the character of the area and / or back onto open park land or fields. They do not have nearby infrastructure to support housing development and therefore would require disruptive new road systems and facilities.

Question Ref: H9

1202 Newlaithes Fields opposite Newlaithes Primary School should be considered unsuitable for development. This is a very important site for the character of the area and is well used by local children and families. It would also add extra strain on an already busy school and traffic dangers if developed. It should be allocated as a public park.

Question Ref: H11

There are lots of areas in North Leeds that have already been granted planning permissions and yet years later no building work has happened. These sites should be developed first and the impact on the local roads and facilities taken into account before any more sites are developed.

Question Ref: H12

Possibly 1053a / 1053b. Sites should be provided for traveller communities and be kept in good repair with decent facilities.

North Comments

Name: Robert Wood

Representor No: PRS05623 Representation ID: REP06280

Question Ref: H7

As a resident of BrownberrieLane, I agree that the area mentioned above is not suitable for housing , therefore agree with the councils view that this site should not be used for housing, for the following reasons:

1. We need to maintain the green belt area around the airport for farming etc
2. Its proximity to the airport and landing/takeoff flight path does not lend it to further development
3. Having listened to aircraft all my life living on Brownberrie Lane. I do not think that housing in this area would benefit residents due to the said noise pollution, Even with baffled windows, the sound does penetrate

North Comments

Name: Robert Wood

Representor No: PRS05623 Representation ID: REP07227

Question Ref: H7

As a resident of BrownberrieLane, I agree that the area mentioned above is not suitable for housing , therefore agree with the councils view that this site should not be used for housing, for the following reasons:

1. We need to maintain the green belt area around the airport for farming etc
2. Its proximity to the airport and landing/takeoff flight path does not lend it to further development
3. Having listened to aircraft all my life living on Brownberrie Lane. I do not think that housing in this area would benefit residents due to the said noise pollution, Even with baffled windows, the sound does penetrate

North Comments

Name: Mark Wood

Representor No: PRS05695 Representation ID: REP06359

Question Ref: H7

Just to let you know that I agree with the present classification of this site, that the site is unsuitable for housing.

Reasons

1/The lane itself suffers from too much traffic & the area in general also suffers from heavy traffic.

2/There is also still a problem with parking on the lane which could cause a problem with the emergency services, as has happened in the past with the fire brigade.

3/The natural beauty of the area would be destroyed.

North Comments

Name: Sharon Woodruff

Representor No: PRS05475 Representation ID: REP06110

Question Ref: H1

I would like you to address the following comments as you develop your proposals for the Moseley Wood Gardens development.

1 - It is misleading for your website to show plans for the 'redevelopment' of the site. This is not previously developed land. There must be sites elsewhere in Leeds that really do need redevelopment. This is not one of them.

2 - The site may be close to local facilities, but I seriously doubt that there is sufficient capacity without significant and timely further investment in them. For example, I commute from Horsforth to Leeds by train each day. Every day, people are crowded together, standing in the train aisles. Where will these extra people fit unless we get more trains? I can see a situation where even more of us will fail to squeeze on to the crowded trains and be left on the platform. A financial contribution under Section 106 would be very unlikely to translate into extra rail capacity. Have you got any evidence that West Yorkshire Metro, Northern Rail and Network Rail would be able to make the necessary capacity improvements? The issue of transport is my main concern with this development and one that I urge you to take seriously. I will make similar representations to the planning authority in due course.

3 - Assuming that many people won't take the train, many will drive. These will use Woodhill Road. Traffic on this road is already busy, and it just takes one parked car to cause queueing traffic. At the junction with Tinshill Road and down to Station Road and Troy Road, there is also often queueing traffic. Once they get out of the Cookridge area, rush hour journeys by car into Leeds are very slow due to the congestion on the routes into town through Headingley and Kirkstall.

4 - The 'concept plan' layout of your site is curious. All of the houses are shown on the inside of loop roads. Can you really say that the development will be limited to 200 homes? It looks to me as if the layout has been designed purposely to allow further houses to be built on the outside of those loops in a later phase.

5 - I welcome the retention of green space, trees and woodland, and I sincerely hope that this will be protected for the long term.

6 - I have not completed your questionnaire as I do not think that it asks the important questions.

7 - Having one consultation event over three hours on one evening was not good enough. I would have liked to have attended but I had other commitments, and no alternative date was provided.

North Comments

Name: Montague Woods

Representor No: PRS00612 **Representation ID:** REP02594

Question Ref: G17

2055 This land is a great asset to the area and the allotment holders and as such should remain as a green site.

North Comments

Name: Clive Woods

Representor No: PRS00949 Representation ID: REP02996

Question Ref: H1

Volume 2: 1 Aireborough

Green Sites

H1 Yes – except one. Most of these sites seem to have the least visual impact on landscape and on local communities.

H2:

Site Ref Site Name

1221 Gill Lane, Yeadon Should be a 'RED' site.

Unsuitable. Green Belt site. Important, highly visible, attractive Green Belt boundary between Rawdon and Yeadon. Development would mean a fully built-up frontage along the A65 between Rawdon and Guiseley – damaging the distinctive features of those communities. Local road network capacity concerns about this development of 155 dwelling on to the A65 which cannot cope at weekends and peak periods. The site is also adjacent to several listed buildings and development of this site would compromise the setting of those buildings.

Question Ref: H4

Amber Sites

H4 No. Reason: Nearly all of the sites are Green Belt, including 9 that we disagree with. They have been included in the Green Belt for sound reasons. The geography of Aireborough means that many of the sites are highly visible and will therefore result in altering the attractive mix of urban and countryside negatively. The fact that these sites are under consideration is evidence that the housing allocation for Aireborough is unacceptable and will lead to a serious loss of attractive Green Belt, without any major improvements to public transport and infrastructure. It is therefore unsustainable.

H5 Unsuitable Sites

Site Ref Site Name the following sites should be 'RED' sites

12 Adjacent to Ivy House

Unsuitable. Ivy House is a listed building – would compromise the setting. Access problems.

1104 Greenside Farm Yeadon

Unsuitable. Green Belt site. Local road network capacity concerns about this development – a total of 344 dwellings from the three sites put forward. Important Green Belt site with footpaths in countryside. Important green boundary between Rawdon and Yeadon. Development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern. Urban sprawl on an attractive landscape site.

1180A and 1180B & 1311A and 1311B Coach Road, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Green Belt in attractive landscape/countryside that would be compromised by development.

Historic Parkland adjacent to listed building.

2038 Low Mills, Guiseley

Loss of employment site.

2162 Warm Lane, Yeadon

Unsuitable. Green Belt site. Local road network capacity concerns about this development – a total of 344 dwellings from the three sites put forward. Important Green Belt site with footpaths in countryside. Important green boundary between Rawdon and Yeadon. Development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern. Urban sprawl on an attractive landscape site.

3026 Ings Lane

Unsuitable. Attractive Green Belt landscape that is an important boundary between Guiseley and Menston. Concern about local road congestion. Urban Sprawl.

3033 High Fold Farm

Green Belt site. High Fold is an important group of 4 or 5 listed buildings. Development would have a negative impact on these heritage assets. The land is an important, highly visible, attractive Green Belt boundary between Rawdon and Yeadon. Local road network capacity concerns about this development – a total of 344 dwellings from the three sites put forward. Important Green Belt site with footpaths in countryside. Development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern. Urban sprawl on an attractive landscape site.

4020 Hollins Lane, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Green Belt site. Highly visible and attractive countryside boundary at the top of Hollins Hill. Would create urban sprawl.

4043 Ings Lane, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Attractive Green Belt landscape that is an important boundary between Guiseley and Menston. Concern about local road congestion. Urban Sprawl.

North Comments

Name: Clive Woods

Representor No: PRS00949 Representation ID: REP02996

Question Ref: H7

Red Sites

H7 Yes. Reason: All have major drawbacks and are therefore unsuitable for housing development.

H8: None

We agree with the following 'red' allocations for the reasons stated:

180 Brookfield House

Unsuitable. In Yeadon Conservation Area. Next to Nunroyd Park, highly visible. Existing house is of historic interest and makes an important positive contribution to the Conservation Area.

1113 Silverdale Ave, Guiseley

Unsuitable: there is a shortage of allotment sites in Guiseley and this should be utilised for allotments.

1148 Thorpe Lane, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Important boundary between Guiseley and Menston.

1180A and 1180B & 1311A and 1311B Coach Road, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Green Belt in attractive landscape/countryside that would be compromised by development.

1194 Hawsworth Lane, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Green Belt site. Highly visible and attractive countryside boundary. Would create urban sprawl.

1256 Wills Gill, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Attractive Green Belt site separating Guiseley and Yeadon adjacent to the Guiseley Conservation Area (some parts appear to be in the Conservation Area). Urban sprawl.

3028 Kelcliffe Lane, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Highly visible Green Belt site. Urban Sprawl.

3029 Land South of Wills Gill

Unsuitable. Attractive Green Belt site separating Guiseley and Yeadon adjacent to the Guiseley Conservation Area (some parts appear to be in the Conservation Area). Important amenity with footpaths through this countryside. Would create urban sprawl. Congestion issues on road network.

3030 Yeadon Banks

Unsuitable. Highly visible Green Belt site. Would create urban sprawl.

3031 Ghyll Mount

Unsuitable. Green Belt and would create urban sprawl – does not relate to existing settlement.

3034 Cold Harbour Farm, Bayton Lane

Unsuitable. Highly visible, important Green Belt area. Development would have a major, negative impact on Rawdon and the character of the area. Congestion concerns about this development on the A65 and A658, particularly in view of the expansion of Leeds Bradford Airport.

3326 N. of Bayton Lane

Unsuitable. Highly visible, important Green Belt area. Development would have a major, negative impact on Rawdon and the character of the area. Congestion concerns about this development on the A65 and A658, particularly in view of the expansion of Leeds Bradford Airport.

North Comments

Name: Clive Woods

Representor No: PRS00949 Representation ID: REP02996

Question Ref: Unspecified

Leeds LDF: Site Allocations Plan Consultation Response

Volume 1: Plan Overview

Housing: It is extremely regrettable that many Green Belt sites are now being considered for housing. Aireborough has experienced many large housing developments in the past 15 years as it is a profitable place to build. Many of these developments have been on former industrial sites - with a consequent loss of employment in the area.

These many 'windfall' sites mean that Aireborough has had more than its fair share of housing development over this period. This should be taken into account in the Housing Allocation Numbers. Data should be produced to show how many actual dwellings have been built in the past 15 years in Aireborough and in the other 'Housing Characteristic Areas'. That imbalance should be redressed in the current process and the Aireborough allocation reduced. Aireborough has one of the lowest 'unbuilt dwellings with planning permission.' Other areas with large residual permissions will have to find fewer new land allocations.

Infrastructure: This should also have been taken into account. Transport infrastructure has changed little in the area, whilst elsewhere there have been new roads (A1/M1 link), and new bus lanes. Infrastructure should be linked to new development. Congestion information confirms this imbalance, which has been exacerbated by the expansion of Leeds Bradford Airport (which again has not been taken into account).

Population Density: Aireborough is a fairly compact area of outer Leeds, with a balance of built up areas and hilly countryside, much of it Green Belt. Current population density should be taken into account when determining allocations. This balance will be compromised by new development on Green Belt land and the quality of life for residents will suffer. Nowhere in the documentation has the allocation been justified. The decision not to include Aireborough in North Leeds or Outer North West Leeds is surprising and has made it much more difficult to find suitable sites.

Ambitious Level of Growth: We note that the housing allocations proposed for Aireborough are based on the regrettable decision to attempt to 'deliver the ambitious level of growth' (ref Vol 1 Overview, p15, 8.2) in the Core Strategy and that this is in direct contrast with the Retail view (p 12, 7.5) of a 'cautious approach to new retail provision', where it is noted that the population growth in Leeds was lower over the last 10 years than previously indicated in statistics. This contradiction in approaches has yet to be explained but is responsible for the large number of Green Belt sites proposed for housing development. We find this incompatible if the intention is to make Leeds the 'Best City'.

North Comments

Name: Clive Woods

Representor No: PRS00949 Representation ID: REP07249

Question Ref: H1

Site 1221

Gill Lane, Yeadon

Unsuitable. Green Belt site. Important, highly visible, attractive Green Belt boundary between Rawdon and Yeadon. Development would mean a fully built-up frontage along the A65 between Rawdon and Guiseley – damaging the distinctive features of those communities. Local road network capacity concerns about this development of 155 dwelling on to the A65 which cannot cope at weekends and peak periods.

Question Ref: H1

Yes – except one. Most of these sites seem to have the least visual impact on landscape and on local communities.

Question Ref: H4

No. Reason: Nearly all of the sites are Green Belt, including 9 that we disagree with. They have been included in the Green Belt for sound reasons. The geography of Aireborough means that many of the sites are highly visible and will therefore result in altering the attractive mix of urban and countryside negatively. The fact that these sites are under consideration is evidence that the housing allocation for Aireborough is unacceptable and will lead to a serious loss of attractive Green Belt, without any major improvements to public transport and infrastructure. It is therefore unsustainable.

Question Ref: H4

12 Adjacent to Ivy House

Unsuitable. Ivy House is a listed building – would compromise the setting. Access problems.

1104 Greenside Farm Yeadon

Unsuitable. Green Belt site. Local road network capacity concerns about this development – a total of 344 dwellings from the three sites put forward. Important Green Belt site with footpaths in countryside. Important green boundary between Rawdon and Yeadon. Development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern.

Urban sprawl on an attractive landscape site.

1180A and 1180B & 1311A and 1311B Coach Road, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Green Belt in attractive landscape/countryside that would be compromised by development.

Historic Parkland adjacent to listed building.

2038 Low Mills, Guiseley

Loss of employment site.

2162 Warm Lane, Yeadon

Unsuitable. Green Belt site. Local road network capacity concerns about this development – a total of 344 dwellings from the three sites put forward. Important Green Belt site with footpaths in countryside. Important green boundary between Rawdon and Yeadon. Development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern.

Urban sprawl on an attractive landscape site.

3026 Ings Lane

Unsuitable. Attractive Green Belt landscape that is an important boundary between Guiseley and Menston. Concern about local road congestion. Urban Sprawl.

3033 High Fold Farm

Green Belt site. High Fold is an important group of 4 or 5 listed buildings. Development would have a negative impact on these heritage assets. The land is an important, highly visible, attractive Green Belt boundary between Rawdon and Yeadon. Local road network capacity concerns about this development – a total of 344 dwellings from the three sites put forward. Important Green Belt site with footpaths in countryside. Development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern. Urban sprawl on an attractive landscape site.

4020 Hollins Lane, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Green Belt site. Highly visible and attractive countryside boundary at the top of Hollins Hill. Would create urban sprawl.

4043 Ings Lane, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Attractive Green Belt landscape that is an important boundary between Guiseley and Menston. Concern about local road congestion. Urban Sprawl.

Question Ref: H7

Yes. Reason: All have major drawbacks and are therefore unsuitable for housing development.

North Comments

Name: Clive Woods

Representor No: PRS00949 Representation ID: REP07249

Question Ref: H7

12 Adjacent to Ivy House

Unsuitable. Ivy House is a listed building – would compromise the setting. Access problems.

1104 Greenside Farm Yeadon

Unsuitable. Green Belt site. Local road network capacity concerns about this development – a total of 344 dwellings from the three sites put forward. Important Green Belt site with footpaths in countryside. Important green boundary between Rawdon and Yeadon. Development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern.

Urban sprawl on an attractive landscape site.

1180A and 1180B & 1311A and 1311B Coach Road, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Green Belt in attractive landscape/countryside that would be compromised by development.

Historic Parkland adjacent to listed building.

2038 Low Mills, Guiseley

Loss of employment site.

2162 Warm Lane, Yeadon

Unsuitable. Green Belt site. Local road network capacity concerns about this development – a total of 344 dwellings from the three sites put forward. Important Green Belt site with footpaths in countryside. Important green boundary between Rawdon and Yeadon. Development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern.

Urban sprawl on an attractive landscape site.

3026 Ings Lane

Unsuitable. Attractive Green Belt landscape that is an important boundary between Guiseley and Menston. Concern about local road congestion. Urban Sprawl.

3033 High Fold Farm

Green Belt site. High Fold is an important group of 4 or 5 listed buildings. Development would have a negative impact on these heritage assets. The land is an important, highly visible, attractive Green Belt boundary between Rawdon and Yeadon. Local road network capacity concerns about this development – a total of 344 dwellings from the three sites put forward. Important Green Belt site with footpaths in countryside. Important green boundary between Rawdon and Yeadon. Development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern.

Urban sprawl on an attractive landscape site.

4020 Hollins Lane , Guiseley

Unsuitable. Green Belt site. Highly visible and attractive countryside boundary at the top of Hollins Hill. Would create urban sprawl.

4043 Ings Lane, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Attractive Green Belt landscape that is an important boundary between Guiseley and Menston. Concern about local road congestion. Urban Sprawl.

North Comments

Name: Clive Woods

Representor No: PRS00949 Representation ID: REP07249

Question Ref: H7

180 Brookfield House

Unsuitable. In Yeadon Conservation Area. Next to Nunroyd Park, highly visible. Existing house is of historic interest and makes an important positive contribution to the Conservation Area.

1113 Silverdale Ave, Guiseley

Unsuitable: there is a shortage of allotment sites in Guiseley and this should be utilised for allotments.

1148 Thorpe Lane, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Important boundary between Guiseley and Menston.

1180A and 1180B & 1311A and 1311B Coach Road, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Green Belt in attractive landscape/countryside that would be compromised by development.

1194 Hawksworth Lane, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Green Belt site. Highly visible and attractive countryside boundary. Would create urban sprawl.

1256 Wills Gill, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Attractive Green Belt site separating Guiseley and Yeadon adjacent to the Guiseley Conservation Area (some parts appear to be in the Conservation Area). Urban sprawl.

3028 Kelcliffe Lane, Guiseley

Unsuitable. Highly visible Green Belt site. Urban Sprawl.

3029 Land South of Wills Gill

Unsuitable. Attractive Green Belt site separating Guiseley and Yeadon adjacent to the Guiseley Conservation Area (some parts appear to be in the Conservation Area). Important amenity with footpaths through this countryside. Would create urban sprawl. Congestion issues on road network.

3030 Yeadon Banks

Unsuitable. Highly visible Green Belt site. Would create urban sprawl.

3031 Ghyll Mount

Unsuitable. Green Belt and would create urban sprawl – does not relate to existing settlement.

3034 Cold Harbour Farm, Bayton Lane

Unsuitable. Highly visible, important Green Belt area. Development would have a major, negative impact on Rawdon and the character of the area. Congestion concerns about this development on the A65 and A658, particularly in view of the expansion of Leeds Bradford Airport.

3326 N. of Bayton Lane

Unsuitable. Highly visible, important Green Belt area. Development would have a major, negative impact on Rawdon and the character of the area. Congestion concerns about this development on the A65 and A658, particularly in view of the expansion of Leeds Bradford Airport.

Question Ref: General comment

Volume 1: Plan Overview

Housing: It is extremely regrettable that many Green Belt sites are now being considered for housing. Aireborough has experienced many large housing developments in the past 15 years as it is a profitable place to build. Many of these developments have been on former industrial sites - with a consequent loss of employment in the area.

These many 'windfall' sites mean that Aireborough has had more than its fair share of housing development over this period. This should be taken into account in the Housing Allocation Numbers. Data should be produced to show how many actual dwellings have been built in the past 15 years in Aireborough and in the other 'Housing Characteristic Areas'. That imbalance should be redressed in the current process and the Aireborough allocation reduced. Aireborough has one of the lowest 'unbuilt dwellings with planning permission.' Other areas with large residual permissions will have to find fewer new land allocations.

Infrastructure: This should also have been taken into account. Transport infrastructure has changed little in the area, whilst elsewhere there have been new roads (A1/M1 link), and new bus lanes. Infrastructure should be linked to new development. Congestion information confirms this imbalance, which is has been exacerbated by the expansion of Leeds Bradford Airport (which again has not been taken into account).

Population Density: Aireborough is a fairly compact area of outer Leeds, with a balance of built up areas and hilly countryside, much of it Green Belt. Current population density should be taken into account when determining allocations. This balance will be compromised by new development on Green Belt land and the quality of life for residents will suffer. Nowhere in the documentation has the allocation been justified. The decision not to include Aireborough in North Leeds or Outer North West Leeds is surprising and has made it much more difficult to find suitable sites.

Ambitious Level of Growth: We note that the housing allocations proposed for Aireborough are based on the regrettable decision to attempt to 'deliver the ambitious level of growth' (ref Vol 1 Overview, p15, 8.2) in the Core Strategy and that this is in direct contrast with the Retail view (p 12, 7.5) of a 'cautious approach to new retail provision', where it is noted that the population growth in Leeds was lower over the last 10 years than previously indicated in statistics. This contradiction in approaches has yet to be explained but is responsible for the large number of Green Belt sites proposed for housing development. We find this incompatible if the intention is to make Leeds the 'Best City'.

North Comments

Name: G E Wordsworth

Representor No: PRS06961 Representation ID: REP03430

Question Ref: H1

• 1033 — GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc) access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

Question Ref: H1

• 1299A — BODINGTON HALL: this should continue to be designated "GREEN" and I would suggest that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services

North Comments

Name: G E Wordsworth

Representor No: PRS06961 Representation ID: REP03430

Question Ref: H1

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: G E Wordsworth

Representor No: PRS06961 Representation ID: REP03430

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

North Comments

Name: G E Wordsworth

Representor No: PRS06961 **Representation ID:** REP03430

Question Ref: H5

• 2130— CHURCH LANE: keep "AMBER" or reclassify as "GREEN" whilst no evidence has been provided of what, if any, recent site survey LCC has carried out on this site, the access concerns articulated in the Site Allocations Plan could be addressed by ensuring that access is from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: G E Wordsworth

Representor No: PRS06961 Representation ID: REP03430

Question Ref: H7

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL - SITE REFS:

- 1178A and 1178B - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1033 - GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY
- 1299A and 1299B - BODINGTON HALL
- 2052 - TILE LANE
- 2130 - CHURCH LANE

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites. Whilst I primarily write to object to the designation of site 1178A at Dunstarn Lane as a green site (ie the site should NOT in ANY way be regarded as suitable for development), I wish to inform you of my views regarding all of these sites and refer below to the relevant provisions of the Leeds Development Framework's "Core Strategy" ("CS") and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. GREEN BELT

NPPF para 89 "...the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are... limited infilling of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of the NPPF by Leeds City Council ("LCC") as it would constitute inappropriate development. The existing housing at Dunstarn Lane does not impact the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt. Developing 1178A would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the following purposes of the Green Belt as set out at NPPF para 80 "Green Belt serves... to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas... to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment... to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." As set out in LCC's own site survey, development here would mean "high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl" and it would cease to assist in safeguarding against encroachment as it would put at risk the neighbouring site 1178B, a site which "performs an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Furthermore, developing 1178A would in no way assist in urban regeneration - not building on the site would encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Also, development of 1178A cannot be unquestionably regarded as "limited infilling" given that the adjoining sites are predominantly landscaped as opposed to developed. NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt... inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

As shown above, allowing development of 1178A would be inappropriate and therefore the NPPF would be directly contravened by LCC unless 'very special circumstances' exist. However the harm to the Green Belt, the biodiversity of the area and residents' amenity is in no way clearly outweighed by other considerations. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing development on the adjoining area and, given that Leeds already has a large supply of such homes (as is irrefutably acknowledged by LCC in CS Policy H4), there clearly are no very special circumstances to justify the construction of new buildings on this Green Belt site. Even if building of smaller capacity homes was somehow decided as being in keeping with the adjoining area, this would still not be a reason to build on a Green Belt site whilst there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances (which cannot be met elsewhere), the selective use of green belt land where this offers the most sustainable option" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..."

Allowing development of 1178A would clearly be a direct contravention by LCC of this provision as there are no exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere and development on this site is not the most sustainable option given its environmental and social amenity (and the only economic gain will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s), not the wider society).

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances" and NPPF para 83 "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"

Allowing development of 1178A would be a de facto alteration of the Green Belt boundary by LCC which would directly contravene both the CS and NPPF given that there are no exceptional circumstances that justify such alteration.

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 "...protecting the Green Belts... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 "...the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence...", NPPF para 81 "...local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

Clearly, allowing the development of 1178A — which would lead to the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents - would be a direct contravention by LCC of these provisions. It is also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

Furthermore, I would invite LCC to give due weight and consideration to:

A) Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

2. SPATIAL STRATEGY AND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) "...identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having "...minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains..." CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

North Comments

Name: G E Wordsworth

Representor No: PRS06961 Representation ID: REP03430

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria (i) location in regeneration areas, (ii) locations which have the best public transport accessibility, (iii) locations with the best accessibility to local services, (iv) locations with the least impact on Green Belt objectives, (v) sites with least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation"

NPPF Core Planning Principle 6 "...encourage the reuse of existing resources...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 7 "contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocation of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value...", NPPF Core Planning Principle 8 "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed", NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties", NPPF para 51 "local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings" and NPPF para 111 "planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and principles by LCC as:

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site
- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents
- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" — it will involve destruction of Green Belt-and-increased congestion -and pollution-from-the-vehicles-of-new-residents-and-the-only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s) NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances... The designation should only be used:

(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 1178B designated as Local-Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy "sites which best address the following criteria... locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways... which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network" NPPF para 38 "...key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties" Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network — tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

Allowing development on 1178A would constitute a direct contravention of the provision by LCC. Only large homes would be in keeping with the existing developments on the adjoining areas and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30

"encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion" CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "...Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched "CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "...Green Infrastructure... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places" NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason" Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided... then planning permission should be refused"

Allowing the development of 1178A would be a direct contravention of these policies and provisions by LCC as:

- whilst there is no evidence provided by LCC of a biodiversity assessment having been carried out, it is well known by residents that the site attracts a variety of birds and animals throughout the year, as well as bats
- the biodiversity of the landscape will be destroyed, not conserved and enhanced and thus significant harm will be suffered
- on the basis that the biodiversity of the area will be impacted, it is unclear how it can be argued, and evidenced, that development of the site would result in an overall net gain for diversity In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

Similarly, due to the reasons set out above in respect of site 1178A applying pretty much equally, the following sites should continue to be designated as "RED" sites not suitable for development:

- 1178B — DUNSTARN LANE

North Comments

Name: G E Wordsworth

Representor No: PRS06961 Representation ID: REP03430

- 1079, 1243 and 1246— LONG CAUSEWAY
- 2052 — TILE LANE

Question Ref: H7

• 1299B — BODINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquits, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for house building than Green Belt protected sites.

North Comments

Name: Phil Worsley

Representor No: PRS01241 **Representation ID:** REP03345

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing development strongly agree. Caveat - brown field sites

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree. Moseley Woods are already busy enough and can't support more cars.

Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree.

The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree.

Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Lynne Worthing

Representor No: PRS00808 **Representation ID:** REP02821

Question Ref: H1

1.1991.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

Does the area really need more houses - There is already many properties for sale.

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Strongly agree

More pollution and a hazard to children.

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Strongly agree

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Stanley Worthington

Representor No: PRS06325 **Representation ID:** REP07270

Question Ref: H1

1199 - Moseley Wood Bottom GREEN TO RED. Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree Greenfields areas in Cookridge are extremely sparse and additional housing will be detrimental to the area and a further encroachment into the countryside. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. The roads in this area are not capable in absorbing additional vehicles and cars. Particularly in the winter months during bad weather. Snow. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. These amenities are over stretched at the moment and further development would make things even worse. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. There are many natural springs in this area and flash flooding already creates problems with drainage. Moseley bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Many wild animals habitat in these fields, i.e. foxes, deer and many birds the beck is known to have supported trout there is a danger that with housing close by the beck could be polluted by rubbish.

North Comments

Name: Suzanne Wouters

Representor No: PRS03591 Representation ID: REP00113

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

Housing development in Cookridgel do not agree as i feel priority should be given to brown field sites and refurbishment of housing which is currently standing empty or not being used to full potential

Question Ref: H2

Site Ref 1199 Cookridgel disagree because at the moment the infrastructure can only just cope with the present number of dwellings and the accelerating birth rate. Are there places in the local schools?The roads around Moseley Wood Gdns are already congested at times with traffic and parked vehicles.Affects on wildlife. The pond on the far side of the beck is home to a protected species of newt.Our naturally evolved landscape is ecologically important.Do we really need to build on green fields that naturally soak away rain water increasing the risk of floods

Question Ref: H3

no

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

1151,3044,3360

North Comments

Name: Mick Wrench

Representor No: PRS03351 Representation ID: REP00992

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

y

Question Ref: H7

Site number 1015 (Hunger Hills and land south of Lee Lane West) is not suitable for housing.

North Comments

Name: Paul Wyeth

Representor No: PRS00815 **Representation ID:** REP02829

Question Ref: H1

1199 1.Cookridge needs NO MORE housing developments.

Strongly agree

2.The inevitable increase in local traffic WILL be a problem.

Agree

3.Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres CANNOT cope with more demand.

Strongly agree

4.The area including Moseley becks is prone to flooding. More building WILL affect this.

Unsure

5.Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat.

Strongly agree

North Comments

Name: Lisa Yalcin

Representor No: PRS05350 **Representation ID:** REP05948

Question Ref: H4

I write in response to a leaflet regarding potential housing in Horsforth, site 1202: land off Victoria avenue.

I live on Newlaithes Road and work at Newlaithes Primary School. Just this past year alone has seen a massive increase in traffic and parking issues, due to the development of the school from a junior to a primary. In September a final cohort will be joining the school along with an extra 60 parents dropping their children off.

[x] I see the many difficulties we face with local residents in terms of traffic. As a local resident I too experience it myself. The corner of Victoria Grove, particularly at school drop off/pick up times can be incredibly dangerous for pedestrians. Regularly people are parked in, doing dangerous turns and reversing blindly down the hill because of the congestion. To add another 185 properties to this area, with its already incredibly narrow streets is preposterous.

North Comments

Name: Judith Yates

Representor No: PRS00461 **Representation ID:** REP02408

Question Ref: G17

2055 – Increased traffic on an already busy road in between two schools. The pollution will increase, with limited access to Carr Manor House. The allotments are in good order and all occupied and have been for a long time it is a secure area the people on Carr Manor Crescent are mostly elderly. It will cause a lot more noise and pollution. Green belt land is getting to be a limited space, not to leave out wildlife, trees, plants.

North Comments

Name: Suzanne Yates

Representor No: PRS00496 **Representation ID:** REP02444

Question Ref: G17

2055 – Increased traffic on already busy road. More pollution this is between two schools the noise level will become more. People on Carr Manor Crescent are mostly of the older generation. People are encouraged to have allotments these have been used for years and are all taken and kept in good order and secure, also wildlife trees plants.

North Comments

Name: Eric Yates

Representor No: PRS01930 **Representation ID:** REP04111

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs no more housing developments. Strongly agree. The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly Agree. The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Michael Yates

Representor No: PRS02175 **Representation ID:** REP04404

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. Madness. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree.

North Comments

Name: Lynne Yeadon

Representor No: PRS01726 **Representation ID:** REP03882

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. Local road already busy, congested with parked cars, road in poor condition. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. Local schools already over subscribed, no dentist or doctor is cookridge. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. Flooding in garden is already on and increased development will increase problems. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. Moseley Bottom I the only small remainder of the original wood. The only benefit of this development is profit for the builders.

North Comments

Name: Michael Yeadon

Representor No: PRS01738 Representation ID: REP03897

Question Ref: H1

Cookridge needs No More housing developments. Strongly Agree. The infrastructure of cookridge can not cope with an increase of housing. The Inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly Agree. The road structure in the area are not adequate for the increase in traffic. Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand. Strongly agree. The local schools are already over subscribed. The area including Moseley Beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this. Strongly agree. The extra hard staning will only increase flooding which at this moment is a major problems nationwide. Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat. Strongly agree. The area is greenbelt for a reason and should be kept that way.

North Comments

Name: Geraldine Youngman

Representor No: PRS00488 **Representation ID:** REP02437

Question Ref: G17

2055 – I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to close the allotments in Stonegate Road and replace them with a housing development on the site. There must be many brownfield sites which could be developed instead, where housing would be an improvement and not an eyesore. I have lived in this area for 70 years and there have been allotments there for as long as I can remember. They are well used and well kept unlike some others and the gardeners who have cultivated them for many years will be forced to give them up. We need to keep all the green spaces we can as a desirable amenity for the local community. I believe at the moment there are long waiting lists of people wanting to acquire an allotment so why close this one. Surely you should be trying to provide more of them to satisfy demand. I consider a housing estate would be a blot on the landscape of this leafy green environment and verging on overcrowding in the area where I live. I am one of the majority of local residents and allotment users will be against this proposal.

North Comments

Name: Gillian Young

Representor No: PRS00478 **Representation ID:** REP02427

Question Ref: G17

I think this land should be retained as green space.

North Comments

Name: Saffron Young

Representor No: PRS03092 **Representation ID:** REP01562

Question Ref: H1

y

Question Ref: H1

I can understand most of the reasons put forward for the use of the green sites. These involve quite a lot of green belt, but in my opinion they are closer to Leeds and as such would not add to the traffic congestion until we get further down the A65

Question Ref: H3

2038 is coded amber, but is Brownfield. The fact that it would require remedial works before a residential use could be considered should not make so much difference. Surely the profit margins of the builders aren't the issue here. Brownfield should be considered before any scrap of greenbelt is used. After all Brownfield has already been developed, but once built on you will never get green belt back.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H4

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H5

I particularly disagree with sites 3026 and 4043. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt, preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley, then looking at the map, 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield Road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

Question Ref: H6

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H7

n

Question Ref: H7

Some of the criteria used to exclude red sites could just as easily be used to describe the amber sites. Terms like urban sprawl are used for red sites, but it becomes rounding off development when it comes to amber sites.

Question Ref: H8

1194. It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the "wrong" side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact. 1256 at Wills Gill. Although quite a large site it would not have as much impact as 3026 and 4043 which are coded Amber.

Question Ref: H9

I particularly think sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl. In fact what is rounding off development if it is not urban sprawl? If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043? Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane. 3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explanatory. In times of heavy rain the field floods and the beck bursts its banks to the east. The stream runs along part of the boundary of this area. Where will the water go if the area is concreted over? The area also acts as a wildlife corridor. Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12, then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload. Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

North Comments

Name: Saffron Young

Representor No: PRS03092 **Representation ID:** REP01562

Question Ref: General comment

The above comments represent the thoughts of a group of people who live in the Moorland Crescent/Ings Lane area. I have submitted them as my own, as I agree with them entirely. [x]

North Comments

Name: Ian Young

Representor No: PRS04746 **Representation ID:** REP00339

Question Ref: H1

n

Question Ref: H1

We should not be building on green field sites, instead we should use more brownfield sites and getting unoccupied housing back into use.

Question Ref: H2

1242. This is a green field paddock surrounding the church and gives the whole area of Meanwood more of the village feel that makes it a very special area in Leeds. To pack the field with houses and blot the view of the church and the green space would be very detrimental to the many residents, particularly those who wait at the bus stop every day and can be refreshed by the green view.

Question Ref: H4

n

Question Ref: H7

n

North Comments

Name: Amy Yuasa

Representor No: PRS00473 **Representation ID:** REP02422

Question Ref: G17

2055 - I think the area should remain as greenspace. The allotments are busy and wel kept serving the community well. My children like to see the vegetables growing so they also have an educational as well as nutritional value.

North Comments

Name: Naoto Yuasa

Representor No: PRS00494 **Representation ID:** REP02442

Question Ref: G17

2055 – The background paper published by Leeds Council and available online clearly points out allotment provisions in Moortown ward falls significantly short of the recommended standard (actual figure 0.06ha / 1000 people against rec 0.24 ha / 1000 people). In addition, PPG17 study also shows increasing number of waiting lists especially in inner North East area.

I believe LCC set up this question G17 to confirm its own view against housing on the allotment in question by hearing voices from immediate neighbourhood.

I, together with my family and my neighbour friends, confirm that we disagree with the possible change from the allotment to housing site.

We strongly believe the site should be retained as allotment. When we moved to this area, we wanted to hire a plot in the allotment but gave up after seeing long waiting lists.

I hope the council consider our views and, in near future, we could teach my kids how to grow vegs and fruits, and importance of sustainable life style.