

APPENDIX 7 – COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE CONSULTATION PERIOD

3RD JUNE TO 29TH JULY 2013

AREA 8: OUTER SOUTH

This document is a copy of all comments received relating to the Outer South Housing Market Characteristic Area (HMCA). The comments are grouped according to the site being commented on. Comments relating to housing sites appear first, followed by retail, employment, greenspace and sites being considered for a mix of uses ('Call for Sites'). The document includes the comments received and details of the name of the person who made the comments, along with a unique reference number (prefix: PRS) attached to that particular person, which will be used again if further comments are made by them at a later stage of the plan process. This is the Representor Number. Each set of comments made also receives a unique Representation Number (prefix: REP).

Comments that have not been connected to any existing site are presented in the 'General Comments' section of the appendix. This includes any new site suggestions.

For Data Protection reasons, individual contact details – address, telephone numbers and email addresses - have been removed.

Comments may not appear exactly as they were originally submitted because they have been recorded against the relevant questions in each area. In the majority, officers have assumed which questions the comments related to. Officers have removed comments that could be considered offensive and/or racist.

The questions as they appear in the Issues and Options documents for Outer South are listed overleaf for reference purposes.

Question List - Outer South

Employment

E1

Do you think a site that is not colour coded 'green' should have been? If so, please state which site (site ref) this is and why

E2

Do you think a site that is not colour coded 'amber' should have been? If so, please state which site (site ref) this is and why

E3

Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'red' are not suitable for allocation for future employment or office development?

E4

Do you think there are other more suitable sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future employment or office allocations? If so, please supply details – address and site plan.

EX

Other comments

Greenspace

G1

Do you have any comments on the proposed boundary amendments, additions and deletions to the greenspace provision in the area as shown on greenspace plan A?

G2

Do you think the Council should consider changing the type of greenspace where that type of greenspace is in surplus (ie more than meets the standard) to another type of greenspace that falls short of the standards?

G3

Do you think the Council should consider allowing development of any of the greenspace sites where that type of greenspace is in surplus (ie more than meets the standard)? If so, which sites?

G4

The quality of many existing greenspace sites in the area falls below the required standard. Do you agree that resources (including commuted sums obtained from planning permissions and legal agreements) should be channelled to improving quality of existing sites?

G5

Alternatively, if a site is of poor quality and/or disused, do you think it is better to consider allowing development of that site to generate resources to invest in greenspace elsewhere?

G6

Do you agree that, where opportunities arise, new greenspace provision should be provided in areas that fall below accessibility distance standards, to ensure residents have adequate access to different types of greenspace?

G7

Have you any other comments/suggestions about greenspace provision in the area?

G8

Part of the existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) allocation at Land to the rear of 26 – 32 Wood Lane, Rothwell has been put forward as a possible housing site (site ref 1355, see page 9). The site was identified as natural greenspace in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this land should be retained as an opportunity for possible future greenspace or could it be released for housing?

G9

Part of the existing UDP N1A (allotments) allocation at the Copley Lane Allotments, Robin Hood and the open space to the east identified as allotments in the Open Space Audit, have been put forward as a possible housing site (site ref 2103, see page 10). Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?

G10

Land at Eshald Lane, Woodlesford which is adjacent to a existing UDP N1 designation and has been identified as natural greenspace in the Open Space Audit, has been put forward as a possible housing site (site ref 3093, see page 11). Do you think this land should be retained in a greenspace use and formally designated as such or be developed for housing?

G11

The existing UDP N1A (allotments) designation at Victoria Road, Rothwell has been put forward as a possible housing site (site ref 3318, see page 12). It was identified as in an allotment use in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?

G12

The existing UDP N1A (allotment) designation at Back Haigh Avenue, Rothwell has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (site ref 3444, see page 12). The site was identified as allotments in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?

Question List - Outer South

GX

Other comments

Housing

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?

H2

Which sites do you disagree with and why? (Give site ref and reason)

H3

Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site ref no. and reason

H4

Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

H5

Which sites do you disagree with and why? (Give site ref and reason)

H6

Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site ref and reason

H7

Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'red' are not suitable for allocation for future housing development?

H8

Which sites do you disagree with and why? (Give site ref and reason)

H9

Do you think a site that is not colour coded red should have been? If so, please give site ref and reason

H10

Do you think there are other more suitable sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocations? If so, please supply details – address and site plan.

H11

The Site Allocations Plan will need to also identify phasing of housing allocations (see Volume 1 page 18). The phases are:

Delivery/development in the short term, 0-5 years

Delivery/development in the medium term, 5-10 years

Delivery/development in the long term, 10 + years

Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state Site ref of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.

H12

Do you think that any sites being considered in this area could be suitable for gypsy and traveller site use? Please state reason, and list site ref of any specific sites.

H13

Do you think there are other more suitable sites not shown on the plan that could be considered for future gypsy and traveller site use? If so, please supply details – address and site plan.

H14

Do you think that any sites being considered in this area could be suitable for use solely or in part for elderly housing accommodation? Please state reason, and list site ref of specific sites.

H15

Do you think there are other more suitable sites not shown on the plan that could be considered for elderly housing accommodation? If so, please supply details – address and site plan.

HX

Other comments

Question List - Outer South

Retail

RVol1

In order to help retain large units for larger scale stores, do you think the plan should contain a policy to protect large stores from being subdivided? If so, what would you consider a reasonable definition of a large store?

R1

Do you have any comments on the proposed centre and Primary Shopping Area (PSA) boundary? Please state the centre/s to which your comments relate.

R2

Do you have any comments on the proposed frontage designations? Please state the centre/s to which your comments relate.

R3

Do you have any comments on the 'call for sites', sites coming forward for retail uses within the plan period.

R4

Do you have any other sites to suggest for retail development?(please provide details and plans)

RX

Other comments

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 129A

Housing

Main Street and Pitfield Road, Carlton, Wakefield

Name: Joanna Hammond

Representor No: PRS03296

Representation ID: REP01403 Question Ref: H14

129A Village location and a good bus service

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 129A

Housing

Main Street and Pitfield Road, Carlton, Wakefield

Name: Brian Bartle

Representor No: PRS03815

Representation ID: REP07200 Question Ref: H1

129A - support green.

1. INTRODUCTION: CARLTON PITFIELD

Sites 129 A & B

1.1. This site amounting in all to 5.90 ha's gross has been identified as 129A 129B with 507 in the current consultation and it is suggested requires considering as a composite.

2. BACKGROUND:

2.1. The site has been allocated as PAS in the UDP and remained as such in the 2006 review. In 1993 an application was approved by LCC but offered for 'call in' where the general embargo on out of urban centre sites was applied and these PAS sites were then filtered out under the then applied planning policy.

2.2. In essence the front of the site has been used as a farm stead but now largely redundant or replaced by alternative facilities and as farmland but also very much ancillary to the previous farmstead where it formed an adjunct very often for parking, dumping shoddy, spent rhubarb roots and machinery and the land used as set a side for periods in between cropping.

2.3. With the relocation of the farm base 2 years ago to Hopefield Farm, Rothwell it is no longer such a functional use and the land will likely retain to be used in farming rotation but not so usefully.

2.4. The land to the north of the site formed the previous HQ and base for the promoters farming operations. It contains the remainder of the rhubarb forcing sheds at the end of life. Packing, storage and office all of which failed to meet modern supermarket standards and along with uncertainties over the planning evolution are now replaced and mean that the site will quite quickly be abandoned and so is readily available.

The farm replacement facility with modern pack house, cold stores and hgv access are all now set up. The sheds here are now rarely used and are to be replaced at Hopefield in the short term. The site is accordingly surplus to requirements

2.5. The allocated site of 507 to the northwest is in part in the ownership of Leeds City Council but it seems in isolation not capable of economic delivery and there are current proposals and approaches identified for the prospect of a joint arrangement between the parties. The access and a lack of a current comprehensive development proposal or opportunity have constrained the immediacy of any immediate application. However it is suggested that these current negotiations will provide an opportunity for the site to be delivered in the short term as a composite.

2.6. There is currently, significantly, house builder interest which would secure an early submission of a planning application and assure deliverability.

2.7. The 'site' is clearly visible from neighbouring properties, but limited from elsewhere, vantages are a section of road at Ouzlewell Green and then from high ground at distance to the south east of St Swithens Farm by the footpath from which there are filtered views for local vegetation, hedges and wood while also the development of Pitfield Road on the east side. Further infilling of this aspect can not be precluded. Landscape proposals can be implemented and can be accommodated without reliance on 3rd party input and indeed additional offsite enhancements can be provided.

2.8. It is held that it relates well, a view upheld by the previous planning inspector & LCC themselves. It fits well as a piece of a jigsaw to round off the settlement and in close association to the village and its amenities which include a shops employment, a junior school, sports field and other amenities. There are significant employment opportunities on the doorstep and locally on the M62 corridor.

3. CORE STRATEGY:

3.1. The emerging core strategy provides a housing target of 70,000 net new dwellings over the plan period. This commentator's assessment is that with the questionable inclusion of sites in the 'outer south' area, the Planning authority will struggle to meet the target without recourse to settlements outside the main urban area.

3.2. Spatial Policy I provides the broad framework and i) provides for the smaller settlements contributing with scale of growth having regard to the settlements size function and sustainability while at ii) identifies three subcategories a) previously developed land, b) suitable infill sites, c) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement. At iii) for development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods.

3.3. It is held that the proposal here meets all the suggested categories and notably makes use of and builds on the strong identity of the village.

4. GREEN BELT

4.1. The site is currently already excluded from the Green Belt. Accordingly the site is not reliant on the potential requirement for the Green Belt Review.

4.2. The site has no known constraints and the issue of local flooding from blocked culverts can be engineered out and additional storm water capacity built in both on and off site works. The potential for archaeology can be conditioned.

4.3. Access can be provided for the principle access for vehicles primarily off

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 129A

Housing

Main Street and Pitfield Road, Carlton, Wakefield

Name: Brian Bartle

Representor No: PRS03815

Main Street and with secondary links and footpath routes onto Pit Field Road and emergency access to Ashton Crescent.

5. SUSTAINABILITY

5.1. The site relates well to the village and takes pressure off outward migration.

5.2. The village is well served by bus routes.

5.3. The township of Rothwell is within walking distance at approximately 1km and there are footpath links to this and open country beyond to the south of the site and to the north west of Rothwell.

5.4. The Promoters have in part a significant land holding in the district as and can add significant landscape works on associated land which is rich with opportunities. There has been discussion with landowners to develop the Leeds Forest by extending the Bullcliffe Wood.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1. The inclusion of the site which can be readily delivered can give an early solution to meeting the Government's key housing objective in the NPPF para 47 'to boost significantly the supply of housing'.

6.2. It is then suggested the site is included as 'green' with greatest potential to be allocated for housing.

Name: Oldroyd Proud

Representor No: PRS04973

Representation ID: REP01988 Question Ref: H3

129B requires colouring green as part of a comprehensive scheme with 507 & 129A. This will give comprehensive scheme which will be required to enable better delivery with currently house builders in bidding.

Representation ID: REP01988 Question Ref: H11

short & medium term

Representation ID: REP01988 Question Ref: H14

129A, levelish access to adjoining amenities.

Representation ID: REP01988 Question Ref: H2

129B requires colouring green as part of a comprehensive scheme with 507 & 129A.

Name: E Oldroyd & Sons (Lofthouse) Ltd

Representor No: PRS04978

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H3

Also include 1298 (Carlton) with 507/129A as a comprehensive parcel to give a more economic and deliverable solution in this District.

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H11

507/129A + 129B short term. 1049/1058 medium term or sooner.

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H14

507/129A + 129B could be ideal candidates with local services available and more settled community locally.

Name: Carlton Neighbourhood Association

Representor No: PRS06375

Representation ID: REP07379 Question Ref: H1

129A

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 129A

Housing

Main Street and Pitfield Road, Carlton, Wakefield

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07466 Question Ref: H1

129a

Representation ID: REP07891 Question Ref: H2

129A Main Street, Carlton - The lack of suitable access is a constraint in terms of being able to demonstrate developability. The need to access the site through adjacent land presents deliverability questions. Until such time as this can be resolved the site cannot be considered one of the most suitable sites in the Market Character Area.

Name: Justin Coley

Representor No: PRS06448

Representation ID: REP07524 Question Ref: H1

Whilst this is a Brownfield site it incorporates land adjoining Main Street that is a valuable community asset, both as a community car park and area of use for sports, pastimes, events and leisure pursuits. The farm on the site is also part of our agricultural heritage.

Car Parking

The hard frontage to the site is used as car parking by residents, parents of children attending Carlton Primary School and customers of the Unicorn Inn and Carlton Social Club. Parking is already a significant issue in Carlton Village, and the recent granting of planning permission to build houses on the open land used for parking opposite Carlton Cricket Club will exacerbate this issue.

The area of Main Street from Albion Street to SAP site 129A is effectively a single lane chicane, due to residents cars being parked all along the South side of this road. Losing the valuable community asset that is the frontage of the site will make parking worse in the Village and has the potential to affect business at the Unicorn Inn and Carlton Social Club.

Sports, Pastimes and Leisure

The hard frontage has been used by the community for sports, pastimes and leisure for many years. Children play and dog owners exercise their dogs on this area.

For the last 3 years the CVRA has held its annual Rhubarbfest event on this hard frontage and it would be devastating for us to be unable to hold this extremely popular community event.

Agricultural Heritage

The farm that occupies the site grows 'Yorkshire Forced Rhubarb', which is a significant part of Carlton's rich agricultural heritage. Each spring the farm holds tours that attract many coach parties (that park on the hard frontage), and provides both the farm and Unicorn Inn with welcome business.

The CVRA considers this site inappropriate for development.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 129B

Housing

Main Street and Pitfield Road, Carlton, Wakefield

Name: Brian Bartle

Representor No: PRS03815

Representation ID: REP07200 Question Ref: H4

129B - objection to amber. Should be green.

1. INTRODUCTION:

CARLTON PITFIELD

Sites 129 A & B

1.1. This site amounting in all to 5.90 ha's gross has been identified as 129A 129B with 507 in the current consultation and it is suggested requires considering as a composite.

2. BACKGROUND:

2.1. The site has been allocated as PAS in the UDP and remained as such in the 2006 review. In 1993 an application was approved by LCC but offered for 'call in' where the general embargo on out of urban centre sites was applied and these PAS sites were then filtered out under the then applied planning policy.

2.2. In essence the front of the site has been used as a farm stead but now largely redundant or replaced by alternative facilities and as farmland but also very much ancillary to the previous farmstead where it formed an adjunct very often for parking, dumping shoddy, spent rhubarb roots and machinery and the land used as set a side for periods in between cropping.

2.3. With the relocation of the farm base 2 years ago to Hopefield Farm, Rothwell it is no longer such a functional use and the land will likely retain to be used in farming rotation but not so usefully.

2.4. The land to the north of the site formed the previous HQ and base for the promoters farming operations. It contains the remainder of the rhubarb forcing sheds at the end of life. Packing, storage and office all of which failed to meet modern supermarket standards and along with uncertainties over the planning evolution are now replaced and mean that the site will quite quickly be abandoned and so is readily available.

The farm replacement facility with modern pack house, cold stores and hgv access are all now set up. The sheds here are now rarely used and are to be replaced at Hopefield in the short term. The site is accordingly surplus to requirements

2.5. The allocated site of 507 to the northwest is in part in the ownership of Leeds City Council but it seems in isolation not capable of economic delivery and there are current proposals and approaches identified for the prospect of a joint arrangement between the parties. The access and a lack of a current comprehensive development proposal or opportunity have constrained the immediacy of any immediate application. However it is suggested that these current negotiations will provide an opportunity for the site to be delivered in the short term as a composite.

2.6. There is currently, significantly, house builder interest which would secure an early submission of a planning application and assure deliverability.

2.7. The 'site' is clearly visible from neighbouring properties, but limited from elsewhere, vantages are a section of road at Ouzlewell Green and then from high ground at distance to the south east of St Swithens Farm by the footpath from which there are filtered views for local vegetation, hedges and wood while also the development of Pitfield Road on the east side. Further infilling of this aspect can not be precluded. Landscape proposals can be implemented and can be accommodated without reliance on 3rd party input and indeed additional offsite enhancements can be provided.

2.8. It is held that it relates well, a view upheld by the previous planning inspector & LCC themselves. It fits well as a piece of a jigsaw to round off the settlement and in close association to the village and its amenities which include a shops employment, a junior school, sports field and other amenities. There are significant employment opportunities on the doorstep and locally on the M62 corridor.

3. CORE STRATEGY:

3.1. The emerging core strategy provides a housing target of 70,000 net new dwellings over the plan period. This commentator's assessment is that with the questionable inclusion of sites in the 'outer south' area, the Planning authority will struggle to meet the target without recourse to settlements outside the main urban area.

3.2. Spatial Policy I provides the broad framework and i) provides for the smaller settlements contributing with scale of growth having regard to the settlements size function and sustainability while at ii) identifies three subcategories a) previously developed land, b) suitable infill sites, c) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement. At iii) for development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods.

3.3. It is held that the proposal here meets all the suggested categories and notably makes use of and builds on the strong identity of the village.

4. GREEN BELT

4.1. The site is currently already excluded from the Green Belt. Accordingly the site is not reliant on the potential requirement for the Green Belt Review.

4.2. The site has no known constraints and the issue of local flooding from blocked culverts can be engineered out and additional storm water capacity built in both on and off site works. The potential for archaeology can be conditioned.

4.3. Access can be provided for the principle access for vehicles primarily off

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 129B

Housing

Main Street and Pitfield Road, Carlton, Wakefield

Name: Brian Bartle

Representor No: PRS03815

Main Street and with secondary links and footpath routes onto Pit Field Road and emergency access to Ashton Crescent.

5. SUSTAINABILITY

5.1. The site relates well to the village and takes pressure off outward migration.

5.2. The village is well served by bus routes.

5.3. The township of Rothwell is within walking distance at approximately 1km and there are footpath links to this and open country beyond to the south of the site and to the north west of Rothwell.

5.4. The Promoters have in part a significant land holding in the district as and can add significant landscape works on associated land which is rich with opportunities. There has been discussion with landowners to develop the Leeds Forest by extending the Bullcliffe Wood.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1. The inclusion of the site which can be readily delivered can give an early solution to meeting the Government's key housing objective in the NPPF para 47 'to boost significantly the supply of housing'.

6.2. It is then suggested the site is included as 'green' with greatest potential to be allocated for housing.

Name: Oldroyd Proud

Representor No: PRS04973

Representation ID: REP01988 Question Ref: H3

129B requires colouring green as part of a comprehensive scheme with 507 & 129A. This will give comprehensive scheme which will be required to enable better delivery with currently house builders in bidding.

Representation ID: REP01988 Question Ref: H11

short & medium term

Representation ID: REP01988 Question Ref: H2

129B requires colouring green as part of a comprehensive scheme with 507 & 129A.

Name: E Oldroyd & Sons (Lofthouse) Ltd

Representor No: PRS04978

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H3

Also include 1298 (Carlton) with 507/129A as a comprehensive parcel to give a more economic and deliverable solution in this District.

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H11

507/129A + 129B short term. 1049/1058 medium term or sooner.

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H14

507/129A + 129B could be ideal candidates with local services available and more settled community locally.

Name: Carlton Neighbourhood Association

Representor No: PRS06375

Representation ID: REP07379 Question Ref: H4

129B- Disagree should be red - see submitted representation for full details.

Highways have advised that development of site 129B (and 507) would need to be combined with development of 129A. We cannot agree that access to this site could be gained from Pit Field Road as it is simply too narrow at either end to cater for the type and volume of traffic that such a large development would bring.

The size of the development upon this site is also disproportionate in relation to the existing settlement.

The CVRA considers this site inappropriate for development.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 129B

Housing

Main Street and Pitfield Road, Carlton, Wakefield

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07891 Question Ref: H5

129B - The site does not presently have a highway frontage. We would question whether Pit Field Lane could form a suitable access. The lack of suitable access is a constraint in terms of being able to demonstrate developability and the need to access the site through adjacent land presents deliverability questions. Until such time as this can be resolved the site cannot be considered as a suitable site in the Market Character Area. Carlton is a small village with limited local services. Development on the scale proposed (in conjunction with sites 507 and 129A) could vastly overwhelm the role and function of this small village. This would be contrary to the spatial approach in the Core Strategy.

Name: Justin Coley

Representor No: PRS06448

Representation ID: REP07524 Question Ref: H4

SITE 129B Main Street and Pitfield Road, Carlton:

Highways have advised that development of site 129B (and 507) would need to be combined with development of 129A. We cannot agree that access to this site could be gained from Pit Field Road as it is simply too narrow at either end to cater for the type and volume of traffic that such a large development would bring.

The size of the development upon this site is also disproportionate in relation to the existing settlement.

The CVRA considers this site inappropriate for development.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 130

Housing

Aberford Road (77/79), Oulton LS26 8HS

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: H14

77-79 Aberford Road, Oulton, Agree green site

good site for elderly accommodation, being in the centre of the village.

Name: D.j Cove

Representor No: PRS05192

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: H1

130 Agree Green - See also representation submitted for full details

We partly support and partly object to this site being allocated in the Site Allocations Plan.

The Forum's wants only the southern half of this site to be developed. We support the development of this part of the site as it is a "brown field" site and its development will reduce pressure on the abundance of sites in the Green Belt. However the garage business on the northern half of the site should be retained as it is one of the largest employers in the Forum's area.

The site is at the heart of the village of Oulton. We wish to see mixed development on the site, including shops and a Community Centre, suitable for youth training. The site is also ideally situated for the provision of accommodation of elderly persons, which we strongly promote and support. It is close to a post office and a number of small shops and is well-served by public transport.

Representation ID: REP05782 Question Ref: H1

130 - Neutral to Green classification - see also representation submitted for full details

We partly support and partly object to this site being allocated in the Site Allocations Plan.

The Forum's wants only the southern half of this site to be developed. We support the development of this part of the site as it is a "brown field" site and its development will reduce pressure on the abundance of sites in the Green Belt. However the garage business on the northern half of the site should be retained as it is one of the largest employers in the Forum's area.

The site is at the heart of the village of Oulton. We wish to see mixed development on the site, including shops and a Community Centre, suitable for youth training. The site is also ideally situated for the provision of accommodation of elderly persons, which we strongly promote and support. It is close to a post office and a number of small shops and is well-served by public transport.

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS06345

Representation ID: REP07323 Question Ref: H1

130 Agree green - see submitted representation for full details

77-79 Aberford Road, Oulton, Agree green site

good site for elderly accommodation, being in the centre of the village.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 130

Housing

Aberford Road (77/79), Oulton LS26 8HS

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 135

Housing

Leeds Road - Lofthouse Hall, Lofthouse WF3

Name: Colin Dawson

Representor No: PRS03138

Representation ID: REP01515 Question Ref: H7

1030, 135,3084. For the same reasons that the site reference 3085 is not suitable for building upon.

Representation ID: REP01515 Question Ref: H8

1030, 135,3084. For the same reasons that the site reference 3085 is not suitable for building upon.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 136

Housing

Alma Villas (site at), Woodlesford LS26 8PW

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: H4

Alma Villas, Woodlesford this is partly in the Green belt but poor access therefore agree amber site.

Name: Jane Milner

Representor No: PRS03833

Representation ID: REP01546 Question Ref: H4

Some, need to be considered individually.Site 136 - support development if highway issues can be addressed.

Name: D.j Cove

Representor No: PRS05192

Representation ID: REP05782 Question Ref: H4

136 - Amber - Disagree should be red - see also representation submitted for full details

We agree with that this site should not be allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

We oppose any development on this site on the grounds that part of the site is within Green Belt and vehicle access is poor in particular the junction of Alma Street and Pottery Lane.

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: H4

143 - Disagree should be green -

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: H4

136 Disagree with Amber

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS06345

Representation ID: REP07323 Question Ref: H4

136 Agree amber see submitted representation for full details

Alma Villas, Woodlesford this is partly in the Green belt but poor access therefore agree amber site.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 136

Housing

Alma Villas (site at), Woodlesford LS26 8PW

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 143

Housing

Aberford Road - site of Glenoit and Minerva Mills, Oulton

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: H4

Glenoit Mills site is brownfield. Leeds flood relief scheme will allow this to be developed for housing or mixed use..Therefore this site should be coded Green.

Name: Jane Milner

Representor No: PRS03833

Representation ID: REP01546 Question Ref: H3

Site 143 - this is a brownfield site and it appears to be on the same level, and therefore I presume the same flood zone, as the adjacent Maltings development which was previously granted permission. Also a flood defense scheme is to built along the canal at this location.

Name: D.j Cove

Representor No: PRS05192

Representation ID: REP05782 Question Ref: H4

143 - Amber Agree - see also representation submitted for full details

We support this site being allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

The proposed Leeds Flood Alleviation Scheme envisages the erection of a 1.3 m embankment between this site and the canal. When such an embankment is built, the site will no longer be at risk from flooding.

We would support its reclassification as "green

". We believe the site is suitable for mixed development and could incorporate a canal-side restaurant. The development would require a good junction with good visibility splays onto Aberford Road. We also favour this site as it is a "brown field" site and its development reduces pressure on development in the Green Belt.

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS06345

Representation ID: REP07323 Question Ref: H4

143 Disagree should be green - see submitted representation for full details

Glenoit Mills site is brownfield. Leeds flood relief scheme will allow this to be developed for housing or mixed use..Therefore this site should be coded Green.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 143

Housing

Aberford Road - site of Glenoit and Minerva Mills, Oulton

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07466 Question Ref: H4

143 - disagree should be red - see submitted site for full details

The site does not presently have a highway frontage. We would question whether Pit Field Lane could form a suitable access.

The lack of suitable access is a constraint in terms of being able to demonstrate developability and the need to access the site through adjacent land presents deliverability questions. Until such time as this can be resolved the site cannot be considered as a suitable site in the Market Character Area. Carlton is a small village with limited local services. Development on the scale proposed (in conjunction with sites 507 and 129A) could vastly overwhelm the role and function of this small village. This would be contrary to the spatial approach in the Core Paragraph 101 states that development "should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding". There are reasonably available sites appropriate for development in the Market Character Area at lesser risk of flood, therefore site 143 is not considered suitable for residential allocation.

Representation ID: REP07891 Question Ref: H5

143 - Paragraph 101 states that development "should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding". There are reasonably available sites appropriate for development in the Market Character Area at lesser risk of flood, therefore site 143 is not considered suitable for residential allocation.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 143

Housing

Aberford Road - site of Glenoit and Minerva Mills, Oulton

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 289

Housing

Main Street, Hunts Farm, Methley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 334

Housing

Fleet Lane (land off), Oulton

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: H1

Land off Fleet Lane, Oulton. This was PAS land, but was recently released for housing to include affordable housing.

Name: D.j Cove

Representor No: PRS05192

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: H1

334 Agree Green

Representation ID: REP05782 Question Ref: H1

334 - Green agree - see also representation submitted for full details

We reluctantly support this site being allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

Planning permission has already been given, to build a maximum of about 80 houses on this site and therefore the principle of residential development has been accepted by Leeds City Council. Therefore we have to support this site as delivering future housing in Oulton. This site will therefore deliver a portion of the housing requirement required over the plan period in the area. We reserve the right to make further comment on the finer details of the proposal once a formal reserved matters application has been submitted to Leeds City Council. We wish to see more affordable housing in the Forum's area and understand that the site will now include 15% affordable homes. The site has only got development to one side and has not got a strong defensible boundary. Its development must not set a precedent for further sprawl into the Green Belt down Fleet Lane.

Name: Hallam Land, Wilson Enterprises Ltd, The Trustees Of The Thurstaston Park Trust

Representor No: PRS06287

Representation ID: REP07510 Question Ref: H1

Firstly we wish to support the inclusion of sites 334 off Fleet Lane in Oulton and 335 off Royds Lane in Rothwell as 'green' sites said to have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing. We concur with the comments made in the summary of reasons for coding. We have been in extensive dialogue with the Council about these sites as part of the planning application process and following detailed assessment, they have been recommended for approval by the Plans Panel(subject to s106 legal agreements which are all but complete now. Our own work demonstrated that the sites were available, suitable, deliverable and also accessible to a range of facilities, hence their 'green' label is fully justified

Representation ID: REP07211 Question Ref: H1

334 - support green

Firstly we wish to support the inclusion of sites 334 off Fleet Lane in Oulton and 335 off Royds Lane in Rothwell as 'green' sites said to have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing. We concur with the comments made in the summary of reasons for coding. We have been in extensive dialogue with the Council about these sites as part of the planning application process and following detailed assessment, they have been recommended for approval by the Plans Panel subject to s106 legal agreements which are all but complete now. Our own work demonstrated that the sites were available, suitable, deliverable and also accessible to a range of facilities, hence their 'green' label is fully justified.

For further comments, see full representation.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 334

Housing

Fleet Lane (land off), Oulton

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999

Representation ID: REP07421 Question Ref: H1

This site adjoins the boundary of the Oulton 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.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 335

Housing

Royds Lane (land off), Rothwell

Name: Andy Mcveigh

Representor No: PRS00034

Representation ID: REP00440 Question Ref: H1

Was initially rejected by independent judgement, local residents views upheld. Now given approval? How? 100 extra cars means traffic problems (schools at either end of Royds Lane) poor access. Local schools full - where will children go to school? Will Rothwell Park be improved at least so children can play there?

Representation ID: REP00106 Question Ref: H1

you hae ignored independent judgements

Representation ID: REP00106 Question Ref: H2

Royds lane , rothwell. Had been rejected for housing. You just changed the rules to overturn a independent inquiry which rejected it on crucial grounds like full schools and access.

Name: Hallam Land, Wilson Enterprises Ltd, The Trustees Of The Thurcaston Park Trust

Representor No: PRS06287

Representation ID: REP07510 Question Ref: H1

Firstly we wish to support the inclusion of sites 334 off Fleet Lane in Oulton and 335 off Royds Lane in Rothwell as 'green' sites said to have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing. We concur with the comments made in the summary of reasons for coding. We have been in extensive dialogue with the Council about these sites as part of the planning application process and following detailed assessment, they have been recommended for approval by the Plans Panel(subject to s106 legal agreements which are all but complete now. Our own work demonstrated that the sites were available, suitable, deliverable and also accessible to a range of facilities, hence their 'green' label is fully justified

Representation ID: REP07211 Question Ref: H1

335 - support green

Firstly we wish to support the inclusion of sites 334 off Fleet Lane in Oulton and 335 off Royds Lane in Rothwell as 'green' sites said to have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing. We concur with the comments made in the summary of reasons for coding. We have been in extensive dialogue with the Council about these sites as part of the planning application process and following detailed assessment, they have been recommended for approval by the Plans Panel subject to s106 legal agreements which are all but complete now. Our own work demonstrated that the sites were available, suitable, deliverable and also accessible to a range of facilities, hence their 'green' label is fully justified.

For further comments, see full representation.

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H1

335 Agree Green - see full submittted represenation for details.

Again a greenfield site and which has been judged as undesirable for development due to important highways issues and safety concerns, due to the restrictive nature of Royds Lane in conjunction with being a main thoroughfare to nearby schools. Also, development of the

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 335

Housing

Royds Lane (land off), Rothwell

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999

Representation ID: REP07421 Question Ref: H1

This site adjoins the boundary of the Oulton 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

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 498

Housing

Pottery Lane, Woodlesford

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: General comment

Built Woodlesford Lock

Name: D.j Cove

Representor No: PRS05192

Representation ID: REP05782 Question Ref: H1

498 - Lime Green agree - see also representation submitted for full details

We support this site being allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

Planning permission has already been given for this site. This site will therefore deliver a portion of the housing requirement required over the plan period in the area.

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: General comment

498 Agree with Lime Green - See also representation submitted for full details

We support this site being allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

Planning permission has already been given for this site. This site will therefore deliver a portion of the housing requirement required over the plan period in the area.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 499

Housing

Aberford Road, Woodlesford

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: General comment

Pottery Lane Approved but held back due to decision on H2 rail line

Name: D.j Cove

Representor No: PRS05192

Representation ID: REP05782 Question Ref: H1

499 - Lime Green Agree - see also representation submitted for full details

We support this site being allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

Planning permission has already been given for this site. This site will therefore deliver a portion of the housing requirement required over the plan period in the area.

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: General comment

499 - Agree Lime Green - See also representation submitted for full details

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 507

Housing

Main Street, Carlton

Name: Oldroyd Proud

Representor No: PRS04973

Representation ID: REP01988 Question Ref: H3

129B requires colouring green as part of a comprehensive scheme with 507 & 129A. This will give comprehensive scheme which will be required to enable better delivery with currently house builders in bidding.

Representation ID: REP01988 Question Ref: H11

short & medium term

Representation ID: REP01988 Question Ref: H2

129B requires colouring green as part of a comprehensive scheme with 507 & 129A.

Name: E Oldroyd & Sons (Lofthouse) Ltd

Representor No: PRS04978

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H3

Also include 1298 (Carlton) with 507/129A as a comprehensive parcel to give a more economic and deliverable solution in this District.

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H11

507/129A + 129B short term.1049/1058 medium term or sooner.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 519

Housing

Holmsley Lane - Langdale PS, Woodlesford

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: General comment

Pymonts Built

Name: D.j Cove

Representor No: PRS05192

Representation ID: REP05782 Question Ref: H1

519 - Lime Green agree - see also representation submitted for full details

We support this site being allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

Planning permission has already been given for this site. This site will therefore deliver a portion of the housing requirement required over the plan period in the area.

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: General comment

519 - Agree with Lime Green

We support this site being allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

Planning permission has already been given for this site. This site will therefore deliver a portion of the housing requirement required over the plan period in the area.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1030

Housing

Green Lane, Lofthouse, Wakefield (known as Pymont Farm)

Name: Colin Dawson

Representor No: PRS03138

Representation ID: REP01515 Question Ref: H7

1030, 135,3084. For the same reasons that the site reference 3085 is not suitable for building upon.

Representation ID: REP01515 Question Ref: H8

1030, 135,3084. For the same reasons that the site reference 3085 is not suitable for building upon.

Name: Jean Banks

Representor No: PRS04868

Representation ID: REP01289 Question Ref: H7

1030 no access and green belt that should be preserved

Name: E Oldroyd & Sons (Lofthouse) Ltd

Representor No: PRS04978

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H6

Consider that 1030 Pymont Farm, Ouzlewell Green could be promoted to an amber allocation as it fits well into the village rounding off and generally free of any recognised constraints.

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H7

Excepting 1030 think can be accepted.

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H7

1030 Pymont Farm - I agree that this should be red for the reasons set out in the consultation document – GreenBelt, access and that it does not relate well to the existing development. If development were allowed on this site it would also make it more difficult to protect the rest of the Green Belt around this site. Residents have suggested that this site might make a useful extension to the cemetery.

Name: Susan Smith

Representor No: PRS06050

Representation ID: REP06893 Question Ref: H7

I also support the red listing of site 1030 Green Lane Lofthouse, for similar reasons (to 3085):

I wish to object to the above site being allocated for future housing development for the following reasons:

I have lived in the village of Lofthouse most of my life and I have seen the village divided by the M62 to which we lost our beautiful village cricket ground and saw a division of the community. To build on this site would lose the village feel altogether with no division between Robin Hood and Lofthouse. This site provides the rural feel that is quickly disappearing from Leeds all the way to Wakefield.

Robin Hood School is already expanding to accommodate the rising birth rate, to a point it will not be able to expand further, it is already oversubscribed, this site would have a dramatic impact on local schools.

There have been problems on Green Lane with flooding, which has supposedly been rectified, taking away this arable farming land would increase the risk of flooding as there would be a massive reduction in soak off area.

Green Lane is already a 'Rat Run' to and from the M62 and the increase in traffic would have a dramatic impact on residents on this road.

Entrances on to the already busy A61 Leeds Road, which has the dangerous crossroad near Rodillian School, would increase the risk of accidents for parents and children using local schools, also the narrow road of Cemetery Lane with narrow footpaths would endanger pedestrians heading to the village of Carlton.

There are elderly residents on Jumbles Lane in sheltered housing, most who have lived in this village all their lives, to take away the rural view for the sake of profit for the house builders would be a travesty.

Therefore this site should not be considered.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1030

Housing

Green Lane, Lofthouse, Wakefield (known as Pymont Farm)

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1035

Housing

Fleet Lane / Eshald Lane (land at), Oulton LS26 8HT

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: H4

Fleet Lane/Eshald Lane,Oulton. This is ribbon development in

the green belt which will encourage further development to the east of site 334 into the Green Belt which will be further from facilities than site 334.

We don't see why the development of site 334 should facilitate this site coming forward. Unlike Site 334, Site 1035 is in

the

Green Belt and is not identified in the current Leeds UDP Review 2006 as a Protected Area of Search. It is situated on a prominent corner position adjacent to land which is being proposed as amenity green space in the Site Allocations Plan. This site should not be classed green and there are other amber sites that ought to come forward before this site. This site has development only to one side and has no good defensible boundaries.

Name: Marshalls Mono Ltd

Representor No: PRS04974

Representation ID: REP07092 Question Ref: H1

Site 1035

The initial "Call for Sites" assessment identified the site as being within the "green" category which identifies sites which the Council consider have the greatest potential for housing. We fully agree with the Council's initial assessment and believe there are significant benefits in allocating this site for residential development. These benefits are considered in detail in the subsequent section of this letter.

See also representation submitted for full details.

Representation ID: REP07092 Question Ref: H11

Site 1035

Achievability

Paragraph 40 of the SHLAA guidance states that:

"a site is achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about the economic viability of a site, and the capacity of the developer to complete and sell the housing over a certain period".

As noted above, the site is located in an attractive area which would attract residential house builders. This has been confirmed by local Agents Adair Paxton who advise that there are relatively high residential values in parts of Oulton and Woodlesford and the site is semi-rural and inherently attractive (see letter from Adair Paxton at appendix 6). It is considered that due to the current agricultural use of the land, the abnormal costs associated with development are low and as such the site would be economically viable for residential development.

The Council's updated SHLAA review (2012) also concludes that the site is achievable for development in the long term (11 + years). We welcome the Council's assessment that the site is achievable however, it is considered that the development of the site could be achieved in the short term (0-5 years).

Taking the above information into consideration, it is considered that the site is achievable for residential development.

See also representation submitted for full details

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1035

Housing

Fleet Lane / Eshald Lane (land at), Oulton LS26 8HT

Name: D.j Cove

Representor No: PRS05192

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: H1

1035 - Disagree should be red

We object to this site being allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

We disagree with the "green" classification of this site. It is within the Green Belt and we strongly oppose its further encroachment. The site has only got development to one side and has not got a strong defensible boundary; it would set a precedent for further sprawl in the Green Belt down Fleet Lane.

We do not see how the approval of Site 334 for development, has an influence on this site status. Unlike Site 334, Site 1035 is in the Green Belt and is not identified in the current Leeds UDP Review 2006 as a Protected Area of Search. It is situated on a prominent corner position adjacent to land which is being proposed as amenity greenspace in the Site Allocations Plan.

If this site is allocated, it is probable that extensions to site 334 would come forward; the argument would be that it would round off the settlement boundary; this would however lead to further encroachment of the Green Belt which we strongly oppose. This is a vulnerable and exposed Green Belt site and there are other less sensitive amber sites that should be considered first for development.

The site might be suitable for the provision of allotments.

Although there is considered to be an adequate provision of allotments in the Rothwell Ward as a whole, there are only a few allotments in the Forum's area and a waiting list for these. Thus there is evidence that more allotments are required in this area.

Overall we are unconvinced by the justification provided by Leeds City Council as to why this site deserves to be put forward as a site which has the greatest potential to be allocated for housing.

Representation ID: REP05782 Question Ref: H1

1035 - Green Disagree - see also representation submitted for full details

We object to this site being allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

We disagree with the "green" classification of this site. It is within the Green Belt and we strongly oppose its further encroachment. The site has only got development to one side and has not got a strong defensible boundary; it would set a precedent for further sprawl in the Green Belt down Fleet Lane.

We do not see how the approval of Site 334 for development, has an influence on this site status. Unlike Site 334, Site 1035 is in the Green Belt and is not identified in the current Leeds UDP Review 2006 as a Protected Area of Search. It is situated on a prominent corner position adjacent to land which is being proposed as amenity greenspace in the Site Allocations Plan.

If this site is allocated, it is probable that extensions to site 334 would come forward; the argument would be that it would round off the settlement boundary; this would however lead to further encroachment of the Green Belt which we strongly oppose. This is a vulnerable and exposed Green Belt site and there are other less sensitive amber sites that should be considered first for development.

The site might be suitable for the provision of allotments.

Although there is considered to be an adequate provision of allotments in the Rothwell Ward as a whole, there are only a few allotments in the Forum's area and a waiting list for these. Thus there is evidence that more allotments are required in this area.

Overall we are unconvinced by the justification provided by Leeds City Council as to why this site deserves to be put forward as a site which has the greatest potential to be allocated for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1035

Housing

Fleet Lane / Eshald Lane (land at), Oulton LS26 8HT

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS06345

Representation ID: REP07323 Question Ref: H4

1035

1035 Disagree should be red - see submitted representation for full details
Fleet Lane/Eshald Lane, Oulton. This is ribbon development in the oven belt which will encourage further development to the east of site 334 into the Green Belt which will be further from facilities than site 334.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1049

Housing

Haighside -south of St Georges Hospital, Rothwell

Name: Roy Garside

Representor No: PRS02042

Representation ID: REP07070 Question Ref: H4

item 2.

This irregular shaped piece of land is well covered by a range of trees and vegetation and is separate from the adjoining farm land and is in different ownership The area was previously a coal mine which was accessed from Low Shops lane as was, prior to the existing residential development and one of the capped off mine shafts is in the approx position of item 3 on the plan. The open areas of the site were landscaped and provided with ground cover planting some years ago by Ground Work Trust at the same time as they did other work forming footpaths along the route of previous mine railway tracks some of which are picked up on the UDP Greenspace Plan.2006

The area provides a significant green space and is the habitat of a wide range of birds and animals. and is linked to othersuch spaces by footpaths and disused railway tracks and streams.

item 3.

Approximate position of maine shaft

item 4.

Formally designated footpath across field to Robin Hood

item 5

Approximate position of spring which provides the start of the Haigh Beck which flows down to Rothwell and through Spring Head Park becoming Oulton Beck.

Representation ID: REP04244 Question Ref: H4

1049 –

The site should not be developed for housing because it is situated in land presently designated as green belt, all reasons not for not developing as site 1058 above other than Item 5. It is accepted that this site can be accessed from either Wood Lane or the main Leeds Road A61.

Note A [Items 2, 3, 4 and 5 also relate to the adjoining site ref 1049]

item 2.

This irregular shaped piece of land is well covered by a range of trees and vegetation and is separate from the adjoining farm land and is in different ownership The area was previously a coal mine which was acquired from Low Shops lane as was, prior to the existing residential development and one of the capped off mine shafts is in the ape= position of item 3 on the plan.

The open areas of the site were landscaped and provided with ground cover planting some years ago by Ground Work Trust at the same time as they did other work forming footpaths

along the route of previous mine railway tracks some of which are picked up on the UDR Green space Plan.2006

The area provides a significant green space and is the habitat of a wide range of birds and animals, and is linked to other such spaces by footpaths and disused railway tracks and streams.

item 3.

Approximate position of main shaft

item 4.

Formally designated footpath across field to Robin Hood

item 5

Approximate position of spring which provides the start of the Haigh Beck which flows down to Rothwell and through Spring Head Park becoming Oulton Beck.

Name: Kirby Louise Duncan

Representor No: PRS03045

Representation ID: REP00664 Question Ref: H1

I am extremely unhappy about the proposed plans in the area. I bought the house I am living in now on Friday last week. However I was totally unaware of your proposals before releasing funds and completing the purchase. I will be consulting my solicitor about the local search that was carried out by yourselves re this. I found out through a neighbour about your proposals as I do not believe you have publicised this to local residents. The area is already highly populated. There is already a lot of traffic in the area. Schools are already over populated with large class sizes. Are you going to build a new school too. Are you going to sort the already shoddy roads to cope with extra traffic. You struggle now to get in the doctors what are you going to do about this. My house currently backs on to a field. A field which I think is great. A field that holds lots of natural wildlife and a right of way to walk in to view the wildlife. How can you take this away when there is hardly any around the area I have bought this house. And how much in value will my house depreciate - because it will. I would have bought elsewhere if I had known. Why didn't this proposed buildings be highlighted in a search? A search that was carried out very very recently. I need to know exactly what action you are going to take on the surrounding land. I am very unhappy and angry and I feel my first ever dream home (as I am a first time buyer) is not the dream home I was led to believe. I would like a full explanation please. [X]

Representation ID: REP00664 Question Ref: H2

1049 and 1058 see above comments -all comments 1359 - see above comments re traffic, schools, doctors , roads, wildlife issues.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1049

Housing

Haighside -south of St Georges Hospital, Rothwell

Name: Colin Dawson

Representor No: PRS03138

Representation ID: REP01515 Question Ref: H3

1365A, 1365B, 1049, 1058 because they are already adjacent to large built areas with sufficient amenities and infrastructure, or can be provided with such as part of the development.

Name: Colin Bell

Representor No: PRS03204

Representation ID: REP01627 Question Ref: H4

Site Ref 1058 and 1049 1. A large portion of both sites are Farmland and local woodland, the loss of this woodland would take away a natural wildlife haven and corridor between Rothwell and Robin Hood. The farmland involved is a fertile and productive site which is regularly used for the production of Rhubarb part of the historical Rhubarb Triangle. The land bordering the existing residential estates and farmland has been left to create natural hedgerows which have been championed by many wildlife organisations following the decline in many wildlife species e.g. the Bee population which is required for the pollination of our crops and many specie of birds for nesting, feeding and reproduction. 2. Roads on existing residential estates within the site references above are not major roads and the influx of a new development would put an additional burden on an already congested area. Emergency and Delivery Services struggle at times to get through, an increase in traffic through these roads would increase the risk of accidents and possible fatalities.3. Lack of good public Public Transport. The bus service in this area already struggles. In the main Peak travel times, it is quite usual for standing room only before the end of Wood Lane. Additional housing wouldput a great pressure in a time when we are being told use public transport.4. Doctors surgeries in Rothwell are full to capacity and it is hard at present to get an appointment when you need one. Rothwell does not have the infrastructure in place to cope with the extra capacity.5. Rothwell does not have the capacity to take a large influx into the education system due to the lack of school places. 6. If these sites were developed the Urban sprawl would come very close to completely surrounding the Farmland, once this happened I believe it would be a matter of time before the land inside this area would be built on an we had an Urban Jungle. 7. If these sites were developed the loss of Farmland would result in a reduction of the labour force required currently.ared

Representation ID: REP01627 Question Ref: H5

Site Ref 1058 and 1049 1. A large portion of both sites are Farmland and local woodland, the loss of this woodland would take away a natural wildlife haven and corridor between Rothwell and Robin Hood. The farmland involved is a fertile and productive site which is regularly used for the production of Rhubarb part of the historical Rhubarb Triangle. The land bordering the existing residential estates and farmland has been left to create natural hedgerows which have been championed by many wildlife organisations following the decline in many wildlife species e.g. the Bee population which is required for the pollination of our crops and many specie of birds for nesting, feeding and reproduction. 2. Roads on existing residential estates within the site references above are not major roads and the influx of a new development would put an additional burden on an already congested area. Emergency and Delivery Services struggle at times to get through, an increase in traffic through these roads would increase the risk of accidents and possible fatalities.3. Lack of good public Public Transport. The bus service in this area already struggles. In the main Peak travel times, it is quite usual for standing room only before the end of Wood Lane. Additional housing wouldput a great pressure in a time when we are being told use public transport.4. Doctors surgeries in Rothwell are full to capacity and it is hard at present to get an appointment when you need one. Rothwell does not have the infrastructure in place to cope with the extra capacity.5. Rothwell does not have the capacity to take a large influx into the education system due to the lack of school places. 6. If these sites were developed the Urban sprawl would come very close to completely surrounding the Farmland, once this happened I believe it would be a matter of time before the land inside this area would be built on an we had an Urban Jungle. 7. If these sites were developed the loss of Farmland would result in a reduction of the labour force required currently.

Name: Richard Frost

Representor No: PRS03939

Representation ID: REP00656 Question Ref: H1

The area around Rothwell does not have adequate infrastructure to cope with any increase in housing. Traffic into and out of Leeds is bad enough now at peak times and the suggested proposals would have a detrimental effect on all the road users. Public transport struggles with existing traffic flow and increasing that would further grid log the area at peak times. Additionally, I object to the proposed loss of open space and wildlife habitat in the areas I identify below.

Representation ID: REP00656 Question Ref: H4

Please see my previous comments regarding plots 1049 and 1058.

Representation ID: REP00656 Question Ref: H2

I am writing to object in particular to the two large proposed housing developments on sites 1049 and 1058. These two areas would saturate north Rothwell and cause significant disruption to the existing population through access and egress and loss of existing amenities.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1049

Housing

Haighside -south of St Georges Hospital, Rothwell

Name: Andrew Johnson

Representor No: PRS03985

Representation ID: REP01484 Question Ref: H5

Disagree with sites 1049 and 1058. Refer to question H2 for the reasons for this.

Representation ID: REP01484 Question Ref: H9

Yes - 1058 and 1049. Reasons listed in H2.

Representation ID: REP01484 Question Ref: H2

I disagree with 2 proposed sites 1058 & 1049. The reasons are as follows:1) There is a variety of wildlife in the area which will be displaced should their habitat be destroyed.2) There are cuckoos in the area which arrive in spring. This species are already in rapid decline3) One point of green belt is to protect open countryside, such a development in this area will result in the loss of greenbelt and farmland. The loss of agricultural land is unacceptable when there is a growing uk population to maintain. Farming land is to valuable to use for housing. Additionally the area is also part of the rhubarb triangle which is renowned throughout the UK. It would be a shame to lose land which is a huge asset to the area.4) The strain on a already struggling infrastructure including schools, doctors,etc 5) The increase in vehicles in the area and hence more congestion. Young childrens safety is at risk as traffic increases.6) Increased risk of flooding from the beck running through the land.7) The potential to disrupt old mine shafts.8) The impact on public rights of way.

Name: James O'Neill

Representor No: PRS04042

Representation ID: REP00842 Question Ref: H3

1058 and 1049, the reason been is that this area has been under the green/open-space plans for the 24 years I have been in this area and longer when talking to others who have live in the area.I have also letters from the council stating that the area to the rear of Haighside Way ETC, could not be change into gardens as we wished to do when trying to buy this land from Wimpey's now Taylor-Wimpey.Also the land which Wimpey initially built on was only given with agreement that a percentage had to left as open/green-space land and not to be developed on.

Representation ID: REP00842 Question Ref: H4

1058 and 1049 are 2 that should be left as they are and re-identified as green/open-space land which they were, this is as I have stated to protect the wildlife in these areas, the public Right-of Ways, the Hedgerows, the Crop producing fields and the havoc it will cause to the infrastructure to this and the surrounding areas

Representation ID: REP00842 Question Ref: H5

1058 and 1049, the reason been is that this area has been under the green/open-space plans for the 24 years I have been in this area and longer when talking to others who have live in the area.I have also letters from the council stating that the area to the rear of Haighside Way ETC, could not be change into gardens as we wished to do when trying to buy this land from Wimpey's now Taylor-Wimpey.Also the land which Wimpey initially built on was only given with agreement that a percentage had to left as open/green-space land and not to be developed on.1058 and 1049 are 2 that should be left as they are and re-identified as green/open-space land which they were, this is as I have stated to protect the wildlife in these areas, the public Right-of Ways, the Hedgerows, the Crop producing fields and the havoc it will cause to the infrastructure to this and the surrounding areas.

Representation ID: REP00842 Question Ref: H8

1058 and 1049, the reason been is that this area has been under the green/open-space plans for the 24 years I have been in this area and longer when talking to others who have live in the area.I have also letters from the council stating that the area to the rear of Haighside Way ETC, could not be change into gardens as we wished to do when trying to buy this land from Wimpey's now Taylor-Wimpey.Also the land which Wimpey initially built on was only given with agreement that a percentage had to left as open/green-space land and not to be developed on.1058 and 1049 are 2 that should be left as they are and re-identified as green/open-space land which they were, this is as I have stated to protect the wildlife in these areas, the public Right-of Ways, the Hedgerows, the Crop producing fields and the havoc it will cause to the infrastructure to this and the surrounding areas.

Representation ID: REP00842 Question Ref: H9

1058 and 1049 are 2 that should be left as they are and re-identified as green/open-space land which they were or colour coded RED, this is as I have stated to protect the wildlife in these areas, the public Right-of Ways, the Hedgerows, the Crop producing fields and the havoc it will cause to the infrastructure to this and the surrounding areas.

Representation ID: REP00842 Question Ref: H11

1058 and 1049 should not be developed at all and left as it is, for people to enjoy the wildlife, walks, fishing and local produce.

Representation ID: REP00842 Question Ref: H2

1058,1049 are 2 of the areas I have a major concern with.This is because of the affect it will have on the wildlife in the area (Cuckoo's,Bats,Heron,Partridge,Swallows/Swifts,Foxes)to name some that will be affected. There is also the country Rights-of-Way, the natural hedgerows, Dolphin river and the small lake next to the river which is fished regular,the loss of crop producing fields which helps the local economy, the mine shafts and air shafts that are dotted around this area and the total havoc it would have with the infrastructure of the area

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1049

Housing

Haighside -south of St Georges Hospital, Rothwell

Name: Christopher Rolph

Representor No: PRS04051

Representation ID: REP01801 Question Ref: G1

Site Allocations 1049 and 1058 In response to the Site Allocation proposals above my opinion is that Greenbelt land that is productively being farmed should not be sacrificed to fulfil a quota for Housing Development. There are considerable Brownfield sites around the city that should be developed and improved before using an invaluable, irreplaceable commodity. The land is important to the local community & provides food for our local shops & supermarkets, as well as long term sustainable employment. Unlike house building that draws in contractors from a far, on mass for a short period of time. The land in question also supports a plethora of diverse wildlife from nesting Cuckoos in the copse in the SE corner of site 1049 to kingfishers that live and fish in the beck that borders the south side of the proposed development to name but two. The public footpath that runs the gauntlet down the middle of the two proposed sites is frequented by the local inhabitants and forms part of a network of public footpaths and bridleways to traverse and enjoy what the local countryside has to offer. Site 1058 has an existing farm in the middle of it and also part of the land to the rear of Haighside Way is already exempt from building on as protected greenspace. The development of the site would highly rely on access via the internal road system of the Haighside Estate and in consideration of the number of properties suggested would be totally unacceptable by way of the volume of through traffic it would create for this quiet estate. Also totalling the two suggested developments together in comparison to the existing developments of St Georges and Haighside and the suggested close proximity would create urban sprawl and clumping of the area. The number of suggested properties far outweighs the number on the two existing developments. Although I am opposed as I have said to the use of Greenbelt land for development, a reduced number of houses on site 1049 with less impact, say from St Georges down to the junction of Wakefield Road, yet not running along the back of St Georges would have lesser impact and be considered more favourably by local opinion than the current plans. One of my neighbours went into Rothwell Library a couple of days ago to view the plans which were after a long search in the storeroom in a box and again in the One Stop Shop..... yes in the storeroom in a box. On a final note the level of Housing Allocation being considered could not be supported by the local and surrounding infrastructure. Schools are so overstretched children are now being sent across the motorway to Middleton and medical services and surgeries are stretched to the limit. At rush hour, twice a day, the actual junction on which you intend to build almost eight hundred houses is grid locked with traffic with tail backs for hundreds of metres. Surely these should be addressed before considering large scale development.

Representation ID: REP01801 Question Ref: G2

In this specific instance agricultural land should stay agricultural land

Name: Jayne Hartley

Representor No: PRS04069

Representation ID: REP01600 Question Ref: H1

To me the word 'green' represents just that! green fields and to be left like that, open space!!! There are public footpaths, wildlife, places where residents walk/cycle through fields.

Representation ID: REP01600 Question Ref: H5

Sites 1049 and 1058 as previous page

Representation ID: REP01600 Question Ref: H2

I object to sites 1058 and 1049. These sites are proposing 772 houses!!! Rothwell and the surrounding areas of Carlton, Robin Hood, Woodlesford etc are already oversubscribed where doctors, dentists and schools are concerned. You have to wait ages for a doctors appointment, we have lost a primary school in Woodlesford and Rothwell, none of which have been replaced and due to the very large development being built in Middleton the Rothwell high schools are full. Try getting a parking space in Morrisons car park when it's busy too. I have no idea where the proposed access roads are, hopefully NOT through existing estates? On a morning it can be a nightmare trying to get out of Rothwell at the Jaw bones traffic lights and this would cause even more tail backs if more residents are added. This area is well known to be a mining area, I remember as a child a mine shaft being exposed in Victoria School grounds. No doubt the proposal would be to cram as many three storey buildings in like the site off Sharp Lane, no idea just how many houses are already being built there not too far away, hundreds by the look of it? I actually back onto site 1058 and can hear foxes, owls, cuckoo so wildlife would be affected, there is also a 'private' pond. Obviously I have more objection to 1058 as this would affect my view, but the land there is also very steep and a large house already occupies the centre of that land. Would it not be possible just to 'extend slightly' site 1049 the newer St Georges estate to possibly the side with a maximum of 200?!! (even this would be detrimental to local infrastructure). I hope my comments can be taken into consideration.

Name: Dennis Brewster

Representor No: PRS04284

Representation ID: REP00627 Question Ref: H2

I have concerns about 1049 & 1058 which clearly impact on a significant green belt site with agricultural value as well as a number of footpaths which are widely used. There is also concerns about access and the only public transport is via buses on wood lane which will be a significant distance away. There is already significant traffic and when the weather is bad then the estate can be inaccessible and as it has been explained to me we are only a priority 3 on gritting which basically means we never get any so how a new load of houses would manage is hard to imagine. Also by going down to the beck is there a risk of flooding?

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1049

Housing

Haightside -south of St Georges Hospital, Rothwell

Name: David Brennan

Representor No: PRS04298

Representation ID: REP00649 Question Ref: H5

Map 29, Sites 1049 and 1058, if developed will result in a significant loss of open space land and wildlife habitat. In addition, Rothwell is already a very busy little town which will deteriorate if yet more houses are built. There are two very large car-parks in the center of Rothwell but at peak times these are bursting at the seams with spaces at a premium, 700 new houses would cause chaos to these already overcrowded facilities to say nothing of the impact on schools etc.

Representation ID: REP00648 Question Ref: H2

Map 29, sites 1049 and 1058, if developed will result in a significant loss open space land and wildlife habitat. In addition, Rothwell is already a very busy little town which will deteriorate if yet more houses are built. There are two very large car-parks in the center of Rothwell but at peak times these are bursting at the seams with spaces at a premium, 700 new houses would cause chaos to these already overcrowded facilities.

Name: Geoffrey Harland

Representor No: PRS04392

Representation ID: REP00592 Question Ref: H4

Sites 1049 And 1058. When we bought this house we understood that the area covered by these sites were classed as greenfield land and that, as such, could not be built on. The land presently forms a separation between the Haightside estate and other areas of Rothwell and provides a habitat for a wide variety of wildlife, which can be observed from the public footpaths through these sites. These areas provide excellent agricultural land used to grow much sought after local produce. I would appeal to the Council to reconsider these sites and change their category from amber to an unsuitable for development red.

Name: Yvonne Bell

Representor No: PRS04492

Representation ID: REP01662 Question Ref: H4

Site Ref 1058 and 1049 1. A large portion of both sites are Farmland and local woodland, the loss of this woodland would take away a natural wildlife haven and corridor between Rothwell and Robin Hood. The farmland involved is a fertile and productive site which is regularly used for the production of Rhubarb part of the historical Rhubarb Triangle. The land bordering the existing residential estates and farmland has been left to create natural hedgerows which have been championed by many wildlife organisations following the decline in many wildlife species e.g. the Bee population which is required for the pollination of our crops and many species of birds for nesting, feeding and reproduction. 2. Roads on existing residential estates within the site references above are not major roads and the influx of a new development would put an additional burden on an already congested area. Emergency and Delivery Services struggle at times to get through, an increase in traffic through these roads would increase the risk of accidents and possible fatalities. 3. Lack of good public Public Transport. The bus service in this area already struggles. In the main Peak travel times, it is quite usual for standing room only before the end of Wood Lane. Additional housing would put a great pressure in a time when we are being told use public transport. 4. Doctors surgeries in Rothwell are full to capacity and it is hard at present to get an appointment when you need one. Rothwell does not have the infrastructure in place to cope with the extra capacity. 5. Rothwell does not have the capacity to take a large influx into the education system due to the lack of school places. 6. If these sites were developed the Urban sprawl would come very close to completely surrounding the Farmland, once this happened I believe it would be a matter of time before the land inside this area would be built on and we had an Urban Jungle. 7. If these sites were developed the loss of Farmland would result in a reduction of the labour force required currently. 8. I am a big advocate of wildlife and it would be a crime if we were to see the destruction of natural habitat for an ever growing development of "concrete boxes" a green landscape turning grey.

Representation ID: REP01662 Question Ref: H5

Site Ref 1058 and 1049 1. A large portion of both sites are Farmland and local woodland, the loss of this woodland would take away a natural wildlife haven and corridor between Rothwell and Robin Hood. The farmland involved is a fertile and productive site which is regularly used for the production of Rhubarb part of the historical Rhubarb Triangle. The land bordering the existing residential estates and farmland has been left to create natural hedgerows which have been championed by many wildlife organisations following the decline in many wildlife species e.g. the Bee population which is required for the pollination of our crops and many species of birds for nesting, feeding and reproduction. 2. Roads on existing residential estates within the site references above are not major roads and the influx of a new development would put an additional burden on an already congested area. Emergency and Delivery Services struggle at times to get through, an increase in traffic through these roads would increase the risk of accidents and possible fatalities. 3. Lack of good public Public Transport. The bus service in this area already struggles. In the main Peak travel times, it is quite usual for standing room only before the end of Wood Lane. Additional housing would put a great pressure in a time when we are being told use public transport. 4. Doctors surgeries in Rothwell are full to capacity and it is hard at present to get an appointment when you need one. Rothwell does not have the infrastructure in place to cope with the extra capacity. 5. Rothwell does not have the capacity to take a large influx into the education system due to the lack of school places. 6. If these sites were developed the Urban sprawl would come very close to completely surrounding the Farmland, once this happened I believe it would be a matter of time before the land inside this area would be built on and we had a concrete Jungle. 7. If these sites were developed the loss of Farmland would result in a reduction of the labour force required currently. 8. I am a big advocate of wildlife and it would be a crime if we were to see the destruction of natural habitat for an ever growing development of "concrete boxes" a green landscape turning grey.

Representation ID: REP01662 Question Ref: General comment

Please, Please rethink your plans - a grey world is not a good one, depressing, cold and insular. We are encouraged to think about Wildlife/nature and the threats they have been under thanks to "Man". Now it's time to put our Wildlife at the top of the chain - working closer to nature.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1049

Housing

Haighside -south of St Georges Hospital, Rothwell

Name: Martin Binks

Representor No: PRS04544

Representation ID: REP01256 Question Ref: H8

1049/1058

Representation ID: REP01256 Question Ref: H2

1049/1058 this area of land would be uneconomic in the line of power cables damaging to the water course enhance flooding in rothwell centre if built on , damaging to wildlife ie pond life bird life insect life small mammel life woodland plus built on already straining old mine workings so all enviromental issues plus putting strain on already busy links to leeds and wakefield it also would infringe public rights of way and cause water and sewage problems rothwell already has flash flood problemsby the church which would be amplified by haigh beck overflowing due to excess water not been able to soakaway this is a problem throughout the country too much land swallowed up by concrete causing water to flow direct into courses not rocket science is it just common sense overflowing car parks schools doctors ect get the picture it is easy for idiots to look at a map and say we will build there but the whole picture is not digested

Name: Ian Boddice

Representor No: PRS04592

Representation ID: REP01226 Question Ref: H2

Site Ref: 1049Objection: Proposed residential development comprising circa. 375 houses with associated access, parking, public open space and landscaping at land at Spofforth Hill, Wetherby. (PREAPP/12/01073)Objection raised on the basis of proposed development having a detrimental effect on existing open countryside views from neighbouring properties. The proposed development would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners and views from residential properties out over open vistas to the north and west of Glebe Field Drive.The open countryside and bridleway network provides an important and valuable recreational facility for local residents and public health benefits that exercise in the community can provide. Patronage of the bridleway linking Spofforth Hill and Harland Way is currently very high, the proposed development would effectively turn the bridleway into a kerbed tarmac footway.The proposed development will have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of its neighbours, by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy and overshadowing of gardens and rear elevations to neighbouring properties of Glebe Field Drive.Concern is also expressed that the developer Belway Homes is providing much needed affordable homes, identified for the LS22 area, in a separate development area in contained within LS9 Easel. Thus reducing the availability of affordable homes in the Wetherby area and maintaining the disproportionate excessive house prices for the area.Concern also expressed at the lack of investment by Leeds City Council in local sports and recreational facilities within Wetherby. Wetherby swimming pool badly needs refurbishment and yet no mention of this is included in the application. How can this facility be expected to cope with the increased patronage that a development of this scale would create?Based on the above concerns I object to the planning application by Belway Homes ref: PREAPP/12/01073

Name: Antony Moody

Representor No: PRS04916

Representation ID: REP01912 Question Ref: H1

wild life,public access,lack of parking and facilatys,

Representation ID: REP01912 Question Ref: H5

1049.1058

Representation ID: REP01912 Question Ref: H11

long,to much desruption to area ,traffic,wildlife ,parking

Representation ID: REP01912 Question Ref: H2

1049,1058.

Name: E Oldroyd & Sons (Lofthouse) Ltd

Representor No: PRS04978

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H3

Notably 1049 & 1058 Rothwell giving rounding off of existing settlement on the west side and well placed with services road frontage and readily available and deliverable without constraint.

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H11

507/129A + 129B short term.1049/1058 medium term or sooner.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1049

Housing

Haighside -south of St Georges Hospital, Rothwell

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H4

1049 - Agree Amber - see full submitted representation for details.

This greenfield site is considered reasonably suitable and acceptable for potential housing allocation but there are some issues that need consideration. It would be preferable that the existing copse, in the south east corner, remains intact as a natural habitat, together with a requirement that a tree/hedge line is formed along the southern boundary, which would create a visible green separation and help mitigate the impact, encroachment and potential sprawl into the Green Belt.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these sites were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible sites have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1050

Housing

Westfield Road (land off), Robin Hood, near Rothwell WF3

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H7

1050 Land off Westfield Road – I agree that this site should be red for the reasons set out in the consultation document. Green Belt, scale does not relate well to existing settlement and would result in significant urban sprawl.

Name: Liz Ranson

Representor No: PRS06046

Representation ID: REP06885 Question Ref: H7

I [x], AGREE that this land is NOT suitable for the allocation of housing. This is a good decision, given the road and access difficulties and already congested traffic flow. The area is a long established 'green' area for family activities, walkers and runners, and is much cherished by the community. Regards [x]

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]

Name: Carlton Neighbourhood Association

Representor No: PRS06375

Representation ID: REP07379 Question Ref: H7

1050

Name: Justin Coley

Representor No: PRS06448

Representation ID: REP07524 Question Ref: H7

SITE 1050 Leeds Road Lofthouse: This site is Green Belt land and its development would represent significant sprawl in relation to the size of the settlement. It also does not connect well to existing dwellings. It would represent further loss of hedgerow and other wildlife havens and the CVRA are concerned about the impact that the sites development would have on West Beck and further downstream, Oulton Beck (AKA the River Dolphin). The size of the development upon this site is also disproportionate in relation to the existing settlement. The CVRA considers this site inappropriate for development.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1050

Housing

Westfield Road (land off), Robin Hood, near Rothwell WF3

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1058

Housing

Haighside, Rothwell LS26

Name: Roy Garside

Representor No: PRS02042

Representation ID: REP07070 Question Ref: H4

Sites 1058 & 1049 - Amber to Red

My general view is that there has been insufficient time both for yourselves and the respondents to properly address the green issues relative to the proposals which do not take into account the extent to which the new developments will impinge upon important landscape features and habitats. I personally think there should be a review of the greenbelt sites once the responses are in to take a deeper look at the sites which are likely to be affected.

However with regard to site reference 1058 Haighside Rothwell it would point out that there are a number of features which would not be available / appropriate for development of the site which is currently within the UDP 2006 Greenbelt.

item 1. On the attached plan there is a triangular area of land to the north west of the site which is clearly open grass/trees and vegetation and is separated from the adjoining farmland. This area is the designated Open Space associated with the adjoining residential development which was carried out by Wimpey the builders in the mid 1970's. The space is planned to be accessed via has an adopted footpath between the houses in Haighside Way
The footpath has recently been blocked off at the open space end.

As far as I am aware the land is still owned by Wimpey and the planning approval for the original residential development will be dependant upon this land remaining as open space associated with the existing development and cannot therefore be included in the proposed site 1058.

item 2.

This irregular shaped piece of land is well covered by a range of trees and vegetation and is separate from the adjoining farm land and is in different ownership The area was previously a coal mine which was accessed from Low Shops lane as was, prior to the existing residential development and one of the capped off mine shafts is in the approx position of item 3 on the plan. The open areas of the site were landscaped and provided with ground cover planting some years ago by Ground Work Trust at the same time as they did other work forming footpaths along the route of previous mine railway tracks some of which are picked up on the UDP Greenspace Plan.2006

The area provides a significant green space and is the habitat of a wide range of birds and animals. and is linked to othersuch spaces by footpaths and disused railway tracks and streams.

item 3.

Approximate position of maine shaft

item 4.

Formally designated footpath across field to Robin Hood

item 5

Approximate position of spring which provides the start of the Haigh Beck which flows down to Rothwell and through Spring Head Park becoming Oulton Beck.

item 6

Low laying wet area with willow trees and nesting for cuckoos which select such areas.

item 7.

The line of the Haigh Beck which is the home of Kingfishers.

item 8

Large pond created some time ago as a buffer area by the Environment Agency to ease flooding in the centre of Rothwell. Well stocked with fish and used by anglers.

item 9

Wooded area presently being cut down by farmer.

Conclusion

The site is within the present UDP Greenbelt and is productively farmed mostly for rhubarb for which the area is famous. This together with the above items of special interest should be seriously considered before allowing the site to be designated for residential development.

If you have any issues please contact me. I would be gratefull for your comments and whether it would be possible to include this as a response to the present consultation process.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1058

Housing

Haighside, Rothwell LS26

Name: Roy Garside

Representor No: PRS02042

Representation ID: REP04244 Question Ref: H4

1058 –

The site should not be developed for housing because

1.It is situated in land presently designated as green belt.

2.It is being actively farmed for rhubarb the local crop.

3.The designated site incorporates areas of green space including landscape features and habitats – see attached Note A [scanned – note at end of rep. Photos scanned].

4.Part of the proposed site includes designated open space from an earlier development, see attached Note A Item 1.

5.The site cannot be accessed from a main road (Wood Lane) only via the adjoining housing development which has not been designed to facilitate this.

6.There is no suitable school accommodation for juniors and infants children presently being sent to Middleton.

7.The proposed development will reduce the amenity of the existing residential site.

[x]

Attach: Wood Lane Circular 001.jpg

Subject Site Allocation Plan. Green Belt issues relative to site ref 1058

Hello [x]

Thanks for speaking to me last week. I have now marked up an Adel photograph of site ref 1058 as you suggested and I attach this with my comments. Items 2, 3, 4 and 5 also relate to the adjoining site ref 1049.

My general view is that there has been insufficient time both for yourselves and the respondents to properly address the green issues relative to the proposals which do not take into account the extent to which the new developments will impinge upon important landscape features and habitats.

I personally think there should be a review of the greenbelt sites once the responses are in to take a deeper look at the sites which are likely to be affected.

However with regard to site reference 1058 Haighside Rothwell I would point out that there are a number of features which would not be available I appropriate for development of the

site which is currently within the UDP 2006 Greenbelt

item 1. On the attached plan there is a triangular area of land to the north west of the site which is clearly open grass/trees and vegetation and is separated from the adjoining

farmland. This area is the designated Open Space associated with the adjoining residential development which was carried out by Wmpey the builders in the mid 1970's. The space is

planned to be accessed via has an adopted footpath between the houses in Haighside Way

The footpath has recently been blocked off at the open space end.

As far as I am aware the land M still owned by Wmpey and the planning approval for the original residential development will be dependent upon this land remaining as open space

associated with the existing development and cannot therefore be included in the proposed site 1058.

item 2.

This irregular shaped piece of land is well covered by a range of trees and vegetation and is separate from the adjoining farm land and is in different ownership The area was

previously a coal mine which was acquired from Low Shops lane as was, prior to the existing residential development and one of the capped off mine shafts is in the ape= position of

item 3 on the plan.

The open areas of the site were landscaped and provided with ground cover planting some years ago by Ground Work Trust at the same time as they did other work forming footpaths

along the route of previous mine railway tracks some of which are picked up on the UDR Green space Plan.2006

The area provides a significant green space and is the habitat of a wide range of birds and animals, and is linked to other such spaces by footpaths and disused railway tracks and

streams.

item 3.

Approximate position of main shaft

item 4.

Formally designated footpath across field to Robin Hood

item 5

Approximate position of spring which provides the start of the Haigh Beck which flows down to Rothwell and through Spring Head Park becoming Oulton Beck.

item 6

Low laying wet area with willow trees and nesting for cuckoos which select such areas.

item 7.

The line of the Haigh Beck which is the home of Ingfishers.

item 8

Large pond created some time ago as a buffer area by the Environment Agency to ease flooding in the centre of Rothwell. Well stocked with fish and used by anglers.

item 9

Wooded area presently being cut down by farmer.

Conclusion

The site is within the present UDP Greenbelt and is productively farmed mostly for rhubarb for which the area is famous. This together with the above items of special interest should

be seriously considered before allowing the site to be designated for residential development.

If you have any issues please contact me. I would be grateful for your comments and whether it would be possible to include this as a response to the present consultation process.

[x]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1058

Housing

Haightside, Rothwell LS26

Name: Roy Garside

Representor No: PRS02042

Name: Kirby Louise Duncan

Representor No: PRS03045

Representation ID: REP00664 Question Ref: H1

I am extremely unhappy about the proposed plans in the area. I bought the house I am living in now on Friday last week. However I was totally unaware of your proposals before releasing funds and completing the purchase. I will be consulting my solicitor about the local search that was carried out by yourselves re this. I found out through a neighbour about your proposals as I do not believe you have publicised this to local residents. The area is already highly populated. There is already a lot of traffic in the area. Schools are already over populated with large class sizes. Are you going to build a new school too. Are you going to sort the already shoddy roads to cope with extra traffic. You struggle now to get in the doctors what are you going to do about this. My house currently backs on to a field. A field which I think is great. A field that holds lots of natural wildlife and a right of way to walk in to view the wildlife. How can you take this away when there is hardly any around the area I have bought this house. And how much in value will my house depreciate - because it will. I would have bought elsewhere if I had known. Why didn't this proposed buildings be highlighted in a search? A search that was carried out very very recently. I need to know exactly what action you are going to take on the surrounding land. I am very unhappy and angry and I feel my first ever dream home (as I am a first time buyer) is not the dream home I was led to believe. I would like a full explanation please. [x]

Representation ID: REP00664 Question Ref: H2

1049 and 1058 see above comments -all comments 1359 - see above comments re traffic, schools, doctors , roads, wildlife issues.

Name: Colin Dawson

Representor No: PRS03138

Representation ID: REP01515 Question Ref: H3

1365A, 1365B, 1049, 1058 because they are already adjacent to large built areas with sufficient amenities and infrastructure, or can be provided with such as part of the development.

Name: Colin Bell

Representor No: PRS03204

Representation ID: REP01627 Question Ref: H4

Site Ref 1058 and 1049 1. A large portion of both sites are Farmland and local woodland, the loss of this woodland would take away a natural wildlife haven and corridor between Rothwell and Robin Hood. The farmland involved is a fertile and productive site which is regularly used for the production of Rhubarb part of the historical Rhubarb Triangle. The land bordering the existing residential estates and farmland has been left to create natural hedgerows which have been championed by many wildlife organisations following the decline in many wildlife species e.g. the Bee population which is required for the pollination of our crops and many species of birds for nesting, feeding and reproduction. 2. Roads on existing residential estates within the site references above are not major roads and the influx of a new development would put an additional burden on an already congested area. Emergency and Delivery Services struggle at times to get through, an increase in traffic through these roads would increase the risk of accidents and possible fatalities.3. Lack of good public Public Transport. The bus service in this area already struggles. In the main Peak travel times, it is quite usual for standing room only before the end of Wood Lane. Additional housing would put a great pressure in a time when we are being told use public transport.4. Doctors surgeries in Rothwell are full to capacity and it is hard at present to get an appointment when you need one. Rothwell does not have the infrastructure in place to cope with the extra capacity.5. Rothwell does not have the capacity to take a large influx into the education system due to the lack of school places. 6. If these sites were developed the Urban sprawl would come very close to completely surrounding the Farmland, once this happened I believe it would be a matter of time before the land inside this area would be built on and we had an Urban Jungle. 7. If these sites were developed the loss of Farmland would result in a reduction of the labour force required currently.ared

Representation ID: REP01627 Question Ref: H5

Site Ref 1058 and 1049 1. A large portion of both sites are Farmland and local woodland, the loss of this woodland would take away a natural wildlife haven and corridor between Rothwell and Robin Hood. The farmland involved is a fertile and productive site which is regularly used for the production of Rhubarb part of the historical Rhubarb Triangle. The land bordering the existing residential estates and farmland has been left to create natural hedgerows which have been championed by many wildlife organisations following the decline in many wildlife species e.g. the Bee population which is required for the pollination of our crops and many species of birds for nesting, feeding and reproduction. 2. Roads on existing residential estates within the site references above are not major roads and the influx of a new development would put an additional burden on an already congested area. Emergency and Delivery Services struggle at times to get through, an increase in traffic through these roads would increase the risk of accidents and possible fatalities.3. Lack of good public Public Transport. The bus service in this area already struggles. In the main Peak travel times, it is quite usual for standing room only before the end of Wood Lane. Additional housing would put a great pressure in a time when we are being told use public transport.4. Doctors surgeries in Rothwell are full to capacity and it is hard at present to get an appointment when you need one. Rothwell does not have the infrastructure in place to cope with the extra capacity.5. Rothwell does not have the capacity to take a large influx into the education system due to the lack of school places. 6. If these sites were developed the Urban sprawl would come very close to completely surrounding the Farmland, once this happened I believe it would be a matter of time before the land inside this area would be built on and we had an Urban Jungle. 7. If these sites were developed the loss of Farmland would result in a reduction of the labour force required currently.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1058

Housing

Haighside, Rothwell LS26

Name: Carol Oldroyd

Representor No: PRS03625

Representation ID: REP01634 Question Ref: H4

For all the reasons stated in my objection under H2

Representation ID: REP01634 Question Ref: H2

1058 having lived in this area for 25yrs and constantly reassured that there will be no building allowed on this site it appears that it is now up for consideration for development. The reasons this particular area was considered unsuitable was because of the air shaft that used to serve the mine. As far as I am aware that is still an issue regarding building. This aside there are many protected species that have made this area their home as it has been relatively untouched apart from farming of the land. Immediately behind our house there is a piece of land that, over a period of 20 years, we have been looking after as it became a dumping ground for everyone's rubbish round about. After approaching Wimpy on numerous occasions regarding either the purchase of this land or at least a promise that it would be cleared and looked after we took it on ourselves to make it more suitable to look out over. Therefore I would like to register an objection to the proposed future development of this area.

Name: Richard Frost

Representor No: PRS03939

Representation ID: REP00656 Question Ref: H1

The area around Rothwell does not have adequate infrastructure to cope with any increase in housing. Traffic into and out of Leeds is bad enough now at peak times and the suggested proposals would have a detrimental effect on all the road users. Public transport struggles with existing traffic flow and increasing that would further grid log the area at peak times. Additionally, I object to the proposed loss of open space and wildlife habitat in the areas I identify below.

Representation ID: REP00656 Question Ref: H4

Please see my previous comments regarding plots 1049 and 1058.

Representation ID: REP00656 Question Ref: H2

I am writing to object in particular to the two large proposed housing developments on sites 1049 and 1058. These two areas would saturate north Rothwell and cause significant disruption to the existing population through access and egress and loss of existing amenities.

Name: Andrew Johnson

Representor No: PRS03985

Representation ID: REP01484 Question Ref: H5

Disagree with sites 1049 and 1058. Refer to question H2 for the reasons for this.

Representation ID: REP01484 Question Ref: H9

Yes - 1058 and 1049. Reasons listed in H2.

Representation ID: REP01484 Question Ref: H2

I disagree with 2 proposed sites 1058 & 1049. The reasons are as follows:1) There is a variety of wildlife in the area which will be displaced should their habitat be destroyed.2) There are cuckoos in the area which arrive in spring. This species are already in rapid decline3) One point of green belt is to protect open countryside, such a development in this area will result in the loss of greenbelt and farmland. The loss of agricultural land is unacceptable when there is a growing uk population to maintain. Farming land is too valuable to use for housing. Additionally the area is also part of the rhubarb triangle which is renowned throughout the UK. It would be a shame to lose land which is a huge asset to the area.4) The strain on already struggling infrastructure including schools, doctors,etc 5) The increase in vehicles in the area and hence more congestion. Young childrens safety is at risk as traffic increases.6) Increased risk of flooding from the beck running through the land.7) The potential to disrupt old mine shafts.8) The impact on public rights of way.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1058

Housing

Haighside, Rothwell LS26

Name: James O'Neill

Representor No: PRS04042

Representation ID: REP00842 Question Ref: H3

1058 and 1049, the reason been is that this area has been under the green/open-space plans for the 24 years I have been in this area and longer when talking to others who have live in the area.I have also letters from the council stating that the area to the rear of Haighside Way ETC, could not be change into gardens as we wished to do when trying to buy this land from Wimpey's now Taylor-Wimpey.Also the land which Wimpey initially built on was only given with agreement that a percentage had to left as open/green-space land and not to be developed on.

Representation ID: REP00842 Question Ref: H4

1058 and 1049 are 2 that should be left as they are and re-identified as green/open-space land which they were, this is as I have stated to protect the wildlife in these areas, the public Right-of Ways, the Hedgerows, the Crop producing fields and the havoc it will cause to the infrastructure to this and the surrounding areas

Representation ID: REP00842 Question Ref: H5

1058 and 1049, the reason been is that this area has been under the green/open-space plans for the 24 years I have been in this area and longer when talking to others who have live in the area.I have also letters from the council stating that the area to the rear of Haighside Way ETC, could not be change into gardens as we wished to do when trying to buy this land from Wimpey's now Taylor-Wimpey.Also the land which Wimpey initially built on was only given with agreement that a percentage had to left as open/green-space land and not to be developed on.1058 and 1049 are 2 that should be left as they are and re-identified as green/open-space land which they were, this is as I have stated to protect the wildlife in these areas, the public Right-of Ways, the Hedgerows, the Crop producing fields and the havoc it will cause to the infrastructure to this and the surrounding areas.

Representation ID: REP00842 Question Ref: H8

1058 and 1049, the reason been is that this area has been under the green/open-space plans for the 24 years I have been in this area and longer when talking to others who have live in the area.I have also letters from the council stating that the area to the rear of Haighside Way ETC, could not be change into gardens as we wished to do when trying to buy this land from Wimpey's now Taylor-Wimpey.Also the land which Wimpey initially built on was only given with agreement that a percentage had to left as open/green-space land and not to be developed on.1058 and 1049 are 2 that should be left as they are and re-identified as green/open-space land which they were, this is as I have stated to protect the wildlife in these areas, the public Right-of Ways, the Hedgerows, the Crop producing fields and the havoc it will cause to the infrastructure to this and the surrounding areas.

Representation ID: REP00842 Question Ref: H9

1058 and 1049 are 2 that should be left as they are and re-identified as green/open-space land which they were or colour coded RED, this is as I have stated to protect the wildlife in these areas, the public Right-of Ways, the Hedgerows, the Crop producing fields and the havoc it will cause to the infrastructure to this and the surrounding areas.

Representation ID: REP00842 Question Ref: H11

1058 and 1049 should not be developed at all and left as it is, for people to enjoy the wildlife, walks, fishing and local produce.

Representation ID: REP00898 Question Ref: G1

This is with regards to the proposals for the Outer South 1058 area.I along with others totally object to the councils proposals for the development of this area.

Representation ID: REP00898 Question Ref: G2

Because we are losing to much Greenspace and Openspace land in this area and up and down the country, what do we do when there is nothing left for the wildlife?

Representation ID: REP00898 Question Ref: G4

Because we are losing far to much of the country's greenspace for housing/retail development.

Representation ID: REP00842 Question Ref: H2

1058,1049 are 2 of the areas I have a major concern with.This is because of the affect it will have on the wildlife in the area (Cuckoo's,Bats,Heron,Partridge,Swallows/Swifts,Foxes)to name some that will be affected. There is also the country Rights-of-Way, the natural hedgerows, Dolphin river and the small lake next to the river which is fished regular,the loss of crop producing fields which helps the local economy, the mine shafts and air shafts that are dotted around this area and the total havoc it would have with the infrastructure of the area

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1058

Housing

Haighside, Rothwell LS26

Name: Christopher Rolph

Representor No: PRS04051

Representation ID: REP01801 Question Ref: G1

Site Allocations 1049 and 1058 In response to the Site Allocation proposals above my opinion is that Greenbelt land that is productively being farmed should not be sacrificed to fulfil a quota for Housing Development. There are considerable Brownfield sites around the city that should be developed and improved before using an invaluable, irreplaceable commodity. The land is important to the local community & provides food for our local shops & supermarkets, as well as long term sustainable employment. Unlike house building that draws in contractors from a far, on mass for a short period of time. The land in question also supports a plethora of diverse wildlife from nesting Cuckoos in the copse in the SE corner of site 1049 to kingfishers that live and fish in the beck that borders the south side of the proposed development to name but two. The public footpath that runs the gauntlet down the middle of the two proposed sites is frequented by the local inhabitants and forms part of a network of public footpaths and bridleways to traverse and enjoy what the local countryside has to offer. Site 1058 has an existing farm in the middle of it and also part of the land to the rear of Haighside Way is already exempt from building on as protected greenspace. The development of the site would highly rely on access via the internal road system of the Haighside Estate and in consideration of the number of properties suggested would be totally unacceptable by way of the volume of through traffic it would create for this quiet estate. Also totalling the two suggested developments together in comparison to the existing developments of St Georges and Haighside and the suggested close proximity would create urban sprawl and clumping of the area. The number of suggested properties far outweighs the number on the two existing developments. Although I am opposed as I have said to the use of Greenbelt land for development, a reduced number of houses on site 1049 with less impact, say from St Georges down to the junction of Wakefield Road, yet not running along the back of St Georges would have lesser impact and be considered more favourably by local opinion than the current plans. One of my neighbours went into Rothwell Library a couple of days ago to view the plans which were after a long search in the storeroom in a box and again in the One Stop Shop..... yes in the storeroom in a box. On a final note the level of Housing Allocation being considered could not be supported by the local and surrounding infrastructure. Schools are so overstretched children are now being sent across the motorway to Middleton and medical services and surgeries are stretched to the limit. At rush hour, twice a day, the actual junction on which you intend to build almost eight hundred houses is grid locked with traffic with tail backs for hundreds of metres. Surely these should be addressed before considering large scale development.

Representation ID: REP01801 Question Ref: G2

In this specific instance agricultural land should stay agricultural land

Name: Jayne Hartley

Representor No: PRS04069

Representation ID: REP01600 Question Ref: H1

To me the word 'green' represents just that! green fields and to be left like that, open space!!! There are public footpaths, wildlife, places where residents walk/cycle through fields.

Representation ID: REP01600 Question Ref: H5

Sites 1049 and 1058 as previous page

Representation ID: REP01600 Question Ref: H2

I object to sites 1058 and 1049. These sites are proposing 772 houses!!! Rothwell and the surrounding areas of Carlton, Robin Hood, Woodlesford etc are already oversubscribed where doctors, dentists and schools are concerned. You have to wait ages for a doctors appointment, we have lost a primary school in Woodlesford and Rothwell, none of which have been replaced and due to the very large development being built in Middleton the Rothwell high schools are full. Try getting a parking space in Morrisons car park when it's busy too. I have no idea where the proposed access roads are, hopefully NOT through existing estates? On a morning it can be a nightmare trying to get out of Rothwell at the Jaw bones traffic lights and this would cause even more tail backs if more residents are added. This area is well known to be a mining area, I remember as a child a mine shaft being exposed in Victoria School grounds. No doubt the proposal would be to cram as many three storey buildings in like the site off Sharp Lane, no idea just how many houses are already being built there not too far away, hundreds by the look of it? I actually back onto site 1058 and can hear foxes, owls, cuckoo so wildlife would be affected, there is also a 'private' pond. Obviously I have more objection to 1058 as this would affect my view, but the land there is also very steep and a large house already occupies the centre of that land. Would it not be possible just to 'extend slightly' site 1049 the newer St Georges estate to possibly the side with a maximum of 200?!! (even this would be detrimental to local infrastructure). I hope my comments can be taken into consideration.

Name: Dennis Brewster

Representor No: PRS04284

Representation ID: REP00627 Question Ref: H2

I have concerns about 1049 & 1058 which clearly impact on a significant green belt site with agricultural value as well as a number of footpaths which are widely used. There is also concerns about access and the only public transport is via buses on wood lane which will be a significant distance away. There is already significant traffic and when the weather is bad then the estate can be inaccessible and as it has been explained to me we are only a priority 3 on gritting which basically means we never get any so how a new load of houses would manage is hard to imagine. Also by going down to the beck is there a risk of flooding?

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1058

Housing

Haighside, Rothwell LS26

Name: David Brennan

Representor No: PRS04298

Representation ID: REP00649 Question Ref: H5

Map 29, Sites 1049 and 1058, if developed will result in a significant loss of open space land and wildlife habitat. In addition, Rothwell is already a very busy little town which will deteriorate if yet more houses are built. There are two very large car-parks in the center of Rothwell but at peak times these are bursting at the seams with spaces at a premium, 700 new houses would cause chaos to these already overcrowded facilities to say nothing of the impact on schools etc.

Representation ID: REP00648 Question Ref: H2

Map 29, sites 1049 and 1058, if developed will result in a significant loss open space land and wildlife habitat. In addition, Rothwell is already a very busy little town which will deteriorate if yet more houses are built. There are two very large car-parks in the center of Rothwell but at peak times these are bursting at the seams with spaces at a premium, 700 new houses would cause chaos to these already overcrowded facilities.

Name: Geoffrey Harland

Representor No: PRS04392

Representation ID: REP00592 Question Ref: H4

Sites 1049 And 1058. When we bought this house we understood that the area covered by these sites were classed as greenfield land and that, as such, could not be built on. The land presently forms a separation between the Haighside estate and other areas of Rothwell and provides a habitat for a wide variety of wildlife, which can be observed from the public footpaths through these sites. These areas provide excellent agricultural land used to grow much sought after local produce. I would appeal to the Council to reconsider these sites and change their category from amber to an unsuitable for development red.

Name: Yvonne Bell

Representor No: PRS04492

Representation ID: REP01662 Question Ref: H4

Site Ref 1058 and 1049 1. A large portion of both sites are Farmland and local woodland, the loss of this woodland would take away a natural wildlife haven and corridor between Rothwell and Robin Hood. The farmland involved is a fertile and productive site which is regularly used for the production of Rhubarb part of the historical Rhubarb Triangle. The land bordering the existing residential estates and farmland has been left to create natural hedgerows which have been championed by many wildlife organisations following the decline in many wildlife species e.g. the Bee population which is required for the pollination of our crops and many species of birds for nesting, feeding and reproduction. 2. Roads on existing residential estates within the site references above are not major roads and the influx of a new development would put an additional burden on an already congested area. Emergency and Delivery Services struggle at times to get through, an increase in traffic through these roads would increase the risk of accidents and possible fatalities. 3. Lack of good public Public Transport. The bus service in this area already struggles. In the main Peak travel times, it is quite usual for standing room only before the end of Wood Lane. Additional housing would put a great pressure in a time when we are being told use public transport. 4. Doctors surgeries in Rothwell are full to capacity and it is hard at present to get an appointment when you need one. Rothwell does not have the infrastructure in place to cope with the extra capacity. 5. Rothwell does not have the capacity to take a large influx into the education system due to the lack of school places. 6. If these sites were developed the Urban sprawl would come very close to completely surrounding the Farmland, once this happened I believe it would be a matter of time before the land inside this area would be built on and we had an Urban Jungle. 7. If these sites were developed the loss of Farmland would result in a reduction of the labour force required currently. 8. I am a big advocate of wildlife and it would be a crime if we were to see the destruction of natural habitat for an ever growing development of "concrete boxes" a green landscape turning grey.

Representation ID: REP01662 Question Ref: H5

Site Ref 1058 and 1049 1. A large portion of both sites are Farmland and local woodland, the loss of this woodland would take away a natural wildlife haven and corridor between Rothwell and Robin Hood. The farmland involved is a fertile and productive site which is regularly used for the production of Rhubarb part of the historical Rhubarb Triangle. The land bordering the existing residential estates and farmland has been left to create natural hedgerows which have been championed by many wildlife organisations following the decline in many wildlife species e.g. the Bee population which is required for the pollination of our crops and many species of birds for nesting, feeding and reproduction. 2. Roads on existing residential estates within the site references above are not major roads and the influx of a new development would put an additional burden on an already congested area. Emergency and Delivery Services struggle at times to get through, an increase in traffic through these roads would increase the risk of accidents and possible fatalities. 3. Lack of good public Public Transport. The bus service in this area already struggles. In the main Peak travel times, it is quite usual for standing room only before the end of Wood Lane. Additional housing would put a great pressure in a time when we are being told use public transport. 4. Doctors surgeries in Rothwell are full to capacity and it is hard at present to get an appointment when you need one. Rothwell does not have the infrastructure in place to cope with the extra capacity. 5. Rothwell does not have the capacity to take a large influx into the education system due to the lack of school places. 6. If these sites were developed the Urban sprawl would come very close to completely surrounding the Farmland, once this happened I believe it would be a matter of time before the land inside this area would be built on and we had a concrete Jungle. 7. If these sites were developed the loss of Farmland would result in a reduction of the labour force required currently. 8. I am a big advocate of wildlife and it would be a crime if we were to see the destruction of natural habitat for an ever growing development of "concrete boxes" a green landscape turning grey.

Representation ID: REP01662 Question Ref: General comment

Please, Please rethink your plans - a grey world is not a good one, depressing, cold and insular. We are encouraged to think about Wildlife/nature and the threats they have been under thanks to "Man". Now it's time to put our Wildlife at the top of the chain - working closer to nature.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1058

Housing

Haighside, Rothwell LS26

Name: Martin Binks

Representor No: PRS04544

Representation ID: REP01256 Question Ref: H8

1049/1058

Representation ID: REP01256 Question Ref: H2

1049/1058 this area of land would be uneconomic in the line of power cables damaging to the water course enhance flooding in rothwell centre if built on , damaging to wildlife ie pond life bird life insect life small mammel life woodland plus built on already straining old mine workings so all enviromental issues plus putting strain on already busy links to leeds and wakefield it also would infringe public rights of way and cause water and sewage problems rothwell already has flash flood problemsby the church which would be amplified by haigh beck overflowing due to excess water not been able to soakaway this is a problem throughout the country too much land swallowed up by concrete causing water to flow direct into courses not rocket science is it just common sense overflowing car parks schools doctors ect get the picture it is easy for idiots to look at a map and say we will build there but the whole picture is not digested

Name: Antony Moody

Representor No: PRS04916

Representation ID: REP01912 Question Ref: H1

wild life,public acess,lack of parking and facilatys,

Representation ID: REP01912 Question Ref: H5

1049.1058

Representation ID: REP01912 Question Ref: H11

long,to much desruption to area ,traffic,wildlife ,parking

Representation ID: REP01912 Question Ref: H2

1049,1058.

Name: E Oldroyd & Sons (Lofthouse) Ltd

Representor No: PRS04978

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H3

Notably 1049 & 1058 Rothwell giving rounding off of existing settlement on the west side and well placed with services road frontage and readily available and deliverable without constraint.

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H11

507/129A + 129B short term.1049/1058 medium term or sooner.

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H4

1058 - Disagree should be red - see submitted rep for full details.

This site is considered unsuitable and inappropriate for development, having highway access issues and also, it is not well linked to the main settlement hierarchy and is adjacent to a designated UDP Ni (Greenspace), also identified as Local Park in the Open Space Audit. Development of this site, and especially if in conjunction with the adjoining site 1049, would lead to unacceptable urban sprawl into the Greenbelt

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1058

Housing

Haighside, Rothwell LS26

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1223

Housing

Watergate (land north of), Methley

Name: Malcolm Ratcliff

Representor No: PRS03887

Representation ID: REP01841 Question Ref: H5

Outer South Housing Sites 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B, 1225C - see separate sheets

Representation ID: REP06015 Question Ref: H7

Outer South Housing Sites 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B, 1225C

We wish to raise an objection to the possible identification of housing sites for the Outer South Area numbered 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B and 1225C on the grounds that such identification would severely compromise the mineral strategy for LCC adopted in January 2013.

A comparison of Plan 8.3 of the current consultation document with Plan 40 of the Adopted Natural Resources and Waste DPD (NRWDPD) shows that these sites sit squarely in the adopted Area of Search for Sand and Gravel (AoS). Any permanent development prior to the extraction of mineral in this AoS should be resisted for the following reasons,

1. Permanent housing development could sterilise substantial quantities of mineral. This could occur either directly because built development is erected over mineral resources, or indirectly by preventing extraction in adjacent areas through closing off access or by unacceptable environmental impacts.
2. The Methley Area of Search represents the LCC's provision for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates within the meaning of the term defined by NPPF paragraph 145 & MPS1 Practice Guide paragraphs 37 – 42. The site assessments for the housing proposals do not therefore do justice to the status of the AoS in the adopted Local Plan. They merely describe the constraint as a safeguarding issue, which it is not. The AoS is a land allocation in a recently adopted Local Plan and should not therefore be considered for an alternative allocation within the lifetime of that plan.
3. Any alternative allocation of land within the AoS will fatally compromise the LCC strategy for aggregates provision for the next 15 years. The only other site identified in LCC combined with available sites in other mineral planning authorities within West Yorkshire will not be sufficient to meet the forecast requirements for aggregates. Evidence provided by LCC officers at Examination of the NRWDPD indicates that the Methley AoS represents 38% of the total quantity of mineral remaining for aggregates extraction (under current constraints) within the whole of West Yorkshire. Without it the rest of the region cannot possibly meet the forecast demand. This will have several effects
 - a. It will increase pressure on constrained areas of LCC to provide the shortfall in aggregates, such as the valued landscape areas of the Wharfe valley.
 - b. It will increase pressure on other mpas, such as North Yorkshire, which are the nearest alternative area to meet the shortfall through the extension of existing sites or the replacement of exhausted sites.
 - c. It will increase carbon miles by unnecessarily cutting off the supply of sustainably sourced local materials, and relying on material travelling a great distance.
4. It is an axiom that minerals may only be worked where they occur (MPS1 Practice Guide paragraph 13). On the other hand, housing may be located anywhere (within reason and with the application of planning constraints). Minerals are also a scarce natural resource when considered in conjunction with the limited range of locations where their extraction may be acceptable environmentally. The Methley AoS is one of only two environmentally acceptable locations identified within the boundaries of LCC. Therefore, mineral extraction in this allocated area should take precedence over any other conflicting land use.
5. The Methley AoS is therefore a strategic resource of aggregates that should not be compromised by alternative land use proposals.
6. Any suggestion of future hope value for lucrative alternative land uses is very likely to make the land within the AoS unavailable to mineral operators under the likely assumption that landowners will not be prepared to deal with mineral operators if they perceive that future hope value will be adversely affected by mineral extraction. Policy statements therefore need to stress the strategic importance of retaining this land for aggregates extraction prior to the consideration of anything else.

We therefore request that these five proposed housing sites should not go forward for consideration as housing or other allocations and should be labelled RED in the site assessment conclusions. The assessment text should be amended to state that any alternative development in the Methley Area of Search will severely compromise the LCC adopted strategy for aggregates provision, and that alternative uses will not be considered for allocation until all recoverable mineral has been extracted from the AoS, or that development can be shown not to adversely affect the mineral yield of this strategic resource area. In addition, we ask that any proposals for housing should be accompanied by a detailed and professional mineral assessment that shows the quantity, extent and quality of aggregate mineral present in the site, proposals for prior extraction, and the likely impact of development on the ability of adjacent areas to produce and transport mineral.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1223

Housing

Watergate (land north of), Methley

Name: Malcolm Ratcliff

Representor No: PRS03887

Representation ID: REP01841 Question Ref: General comment

Outer South Housing Sites 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B, 1225C We wish to raise an objection to the possible identification of housing sites for the Outer South Area numbered 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B and 1225C on the grounds that such identification would severely compromise the mineral strategy for LCC adopted in January 2013. A comparison of Plan 8.3 of the current consultation document with Plan 40 of the Adopted Natural Resources and Waste DPD (NRWDPD) shows that these sites sit squarely in the adopted Area of Search for Sand and Gravel (AoS). Any permanent development prior to the extraction of mineral in this AoS should be resisted for the following reasons, 1. Permanent housing development could sterilise substantial quantities of mineral. This could occur either directly because built development is erected over mineral resources, or indirectly by preventing extraction in adjacent areas through closing off access or by unacceptable environmental impacts. 2. The Methley Area of Search represents the LCC's provision for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates within the meaning of the term defined by NPPF paragraph 145 & MPS1 Practice Guide paragraphs 37 – 42. The site assessments for the housing proposals do not therefore do justice to the status of the AoS in the adopted Local Plan. They merely describe the constraint as a safeguarding issue, which it is not. The AoS is a land allocation in a recently adopted Local Plan and should not therefore be considered for an alternative allocation within the lifetime of that plan. 3. Any alternative allocation of land within the AoS will fatally compromise the LCC strategy for aggregates provision for the next 15 years. The only other site identified in LCC combined with available sites in other mineral planning authorities within West Yorkshire will not be sufficient to meet the forecast requirements for aggregates. Evidence provided by LCC officers at Examination of the NRWDPD indicates that the Methley AoS represents 38% of the total quantity of mineral remaining for aggregates extraction (under current constraints) within the whole of West Yorkshire. Without it the rest of the region cannot possibly meet the forecast demand. This will have several effects a. It will increase pressure on constrained areas of LCC to provide the shortfall in aggregates, such as the valued landscape areas of the Wharfe valley. b. It will increase pressure on other mpas, such as North Yorkshire, which are the nearest alternative area to meet the shortfall through the extension of existing sites or the replacement of exhausted sites. c. It will increase carbon miles by unnecessarily cutting off the supply of sustainably sourced local materials, and relying on material travelling a great distance. 4. It is an axiom that minerals may only be worked where they occur (MPS1 Practice Guide paragraph 13). On the other hand, housing may be located anywhere (within reason and with the application of planning constraints). Minerals are also a scarce natural resource when considered in conjunction with the limited range of locations where their extraction may be acceptable environmentally. The Methley AoS is one of only two environmentally acceptable locations identified within the boundaries of LCC. Therefore, mineral extraction in this allocated area should take precedence over any other conflicting land use. 5. The Methley AoS is therefore a strategic resource of aggregates that should not be compromised by alternative land use proposals. 6. Any suggestion of future hope value for lucrative alternative land uses is very likely to make the land within the AoS unavailable to mineral operators under the likely assumption that landowners will not be prepared to deal with mineral operators if they perceive that future hope value will be adversely affected by mineral extraction. Policy statements therefore need to stress the strategic importance of retaining this land for aggregates extraction prior to the consideration of anything else. We therefore request that these five proposed housing sites should not go forward for consideration as housing or other allocations and should be labelled RED in the site assessment conclusions. The assessment text should be amended to state that any alternative development in the Methley Area of Search will severely compromise the LCC adopted strategy for aggregates provision, and that alternative uses will not be considered for allocation until all recoverable mineral has been extracted from the AoS, or that development can be shown not to adversely affect the mineral yield of this strategic resource area. In addition, we ask that any proposals for housing should be accompanied by a detailed and professional mineral assessment that shows the quantity, extent and quality of aggregate mineral present in the site, proposals for prior extraction, and the likely impact of development on the ability of adjacent areas to produce and transport mineral.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1224

Housing

Church Lane (land south of), Mickletown

Name: Malcolm Ratcliff

Representor No: PRS03887

Representation ID: REP06015 Question Ref: H4

Outer South Housing Sites 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B, 1225C

We wish to raise an objection to the possible identification of housing sites for the Outer South Area numbered 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B and 1225C on the grounds that such identification would severely compromise the mineral strategy for LCC adopted in January 2013.

A comparison of Plan 8.3 of the current consultation document with Plan 40 of the Adopted Natural Resources and Waste DPD (NRWDPD) shows that these sites sit squarely in the adopted Area of Search for Sand and Gravel (AoS). Any permanent development prior to the extraction of mineral in this AoS should be resisted for the following reasons,

1. Permanent housing development could sterilise substantial quantities of mineral. This could occur either directly because built development is erected over mineral resources, or indirectly by preventing extraction in adjacent areas through closing off access or by unacceptable environmental impacts.

2. The Methley Area of Search represents the LCC's provision for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates within the meaning of the term defined by NPPF paragraph 145 & MPS1 Practice Guide paragraphs 37 – 42. The site assessments for the housing proposals do not therefore do justice to the status of the AoS in the adopted Local Plan. They merely describe the constraint as a safeguarding issue, which it is not. The AoS is a land allocation in a recently adopted Local Plan and should not therefore be considered for an alternative allocation within the lifetime of that plan.

3. Any alternative allocation of land within the AoS will fatally compromise the LCC strategy for aggregates provision for the next 15 years. The only other site identified in LCC combined with available sites in other mineral planning authorities within West Yorkshire will not be sufficient to meet the forecast requirements for aggregates. Evidence provided by LCC officers at Examination of the NRWDPD indicates that the Methley AoS represents 38% of the total quantity of mineral remaining for aggregates extraction (under current constraints) within the whole of West Yorkshire. Without it the rest of the region cannot possibly meet the forecast demand. This will have several effects

a. It will increase pressure on constrained areas of LCC to provide the shortfall in aggregates, such as the valued landscape areas of the Wharfe valley.

b. It will increase pressure on other mpas, such as North Yorkshire, which are the nearest alternative area to meet the shortfall through the extension of existing sites or the replacement of exhausted sites.

c. It will increase carbon miles by unnecessarily cutting off the supply of sustainably sourced local materials, and relying on material travelling a great distance.

4. It is an axiom that minerals may only be worked where they occur (MPS1 Practice Guide paragraph 13). On the other hand, housing may be located anywhere (within reason and with the application of planning constraints). Minerals are also a scarce natural resource when considered in conjunction with the limited range of locations where their extraction may be acceptable environmentally. The Methley AoS is one of only two environmentally acceptable locations identified within the boundaries of LCC. Therefore, mineral extraction in this allocated area should take precedence over any other conflicting land use.

5. The Methley AoS is therefore a strategic resource of aggregates that should not be compromised by alternative land use proposals.

6. Any suggestion of future hope value for lucrative alternative land uses is very likely to make the land within the AoS unavailable to mineral operators under the likely assumption that landowners will not be prepared to deal with mineral operators if they perceive that future hope value will be adversely affected by mineral extraction. Policy statements therefore need to stress the strategic importance of retaining this land for aggregates extraction prior to the consideration of anything else.

We therefore request that these five proposed housing sites should not go forward for consideration as housing or other allocations and should be labelled RED in the site assessment conclusions. The assessment text should be amended to state that any alternative development in the Methley Area of Search will severely compromise the LCC adopted strategy for aggregates provision, and that alternative uses will not be considered for allocation until all recoverable mineral has been extracted from the AoS, or that development can be shown not to adversely affect the mineral yield of this strategic resource area. In addition, we ask that any proposals for housing should be accompanied by a detailed and professional mineral assessment that shows the quantity, extent and quality of aggregate mineral present in the site, proposals for prior extraction, and the likely impact of development on the ability of adjacent areas to produce and transport mineral.

Representation ID: REP01841 Question Ref: H5

Outer South Housing Sites 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B, 1225C - see separate sheets

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1224

Housing

Church Lane (land south of), Mickletown

Name: Malcolm Ratcliff

Representor No: PRS03887

Representation ID: REP01841 Question Ref: General comment

Outer South Housing Sites 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B, 1225C We wish to raise an objection to the possible identification of housing sites for the Outer South Area numbered 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B and 1225C on the grounds that such identification would severely compromise the mineral strategy for LCC adopted in January 2013. A comparison of Plan 8.3 of the current consultation document with Plan 40 of the Adopted Natural Resources and Waste DPD (NRWDPD) shows that these sites sit squarely in the adopted Area of Search for Sand and Gravel (AoS). Any permanent development prior to the extraction of mineral in this AoS should be resisted for the following reasons, 1. Permanent housing development could sterilise substantial quantities of mineral. This could occur either directly because built development is erected over mineral resources, or indirectly by preventing extraction in adjacent areas through closing off access or by unacceptable environmental impacts. 2. The Methley Area of Search represents the LCC's provision for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates within the meaning of the term defined by NPPF paragraph 145 & MPS1 Practice Guide paragraphs 37 – 42. The site assessments for the housing proposals do not therefore do justice to the status of the AoS in the adopted Local Plan. They merely describe the constraint as a safeguarding issue, which it is not. The AoS is a land allocation in a recently adopted Local Plan and should not therefore be considered for an alternative allocation within the lifetime of that plan. 3. Any alternative allocation of land within the AoS will fatally compromise the LCC strategy for aggregates provision for the next 15 years. The only other site identified in LCC combined with available sites in other mineral planning authorities within West Yorkshire will not be sufficient to meet the forecast requirements for aggregates. Evidence provided by LCC officers at Examination of the NRWDPD indicates that the Methley AoS represents 38% of the total quantity of mineral remaining for aggregates extraction (under current constraints) within the whole of West Yorkshire. Without it the rest of the region cannot possibly meet the forecast demand. This will have several effects a. It will increase pressure on constrained areas of LCC to provide the shortfall in aggregates, such as the valued landscape areas of the Wharfe valley. b. It will increase pressure on other mpas, such as North Yorkshire, which are the nearest alternative area to meet the shortfall through the extension of existing sites or the replacement of exhausted sites. c. It will increase carbon miles by unnecessarily cutting off the supply of sustainably sourced local materials, and relying on material travelling a great distance. 4. It is an axiom that minerals may only be worked where they occur (MPS1 Practice Guide paragraph 13). On the other hand, housing may be located anywhere (within reason and with the application of planning constraints). Minerals are also a scarce natural resource when considered in conjunction with the limited range of locations where their extraction may be acceptable environmentally. The Methley AoS is one of only two environmentally acceptable locations identified within the boundaries of LCC. Therefore, mineral extraction in this allocated area should take precedence over any other conflicting land use. 5. The Methley AoS is therefore a strategic resource of aggregates that should not be compromised by alternative land use proposals. 6. Any suggestion of future hope value for lucrative alternative land uses is very likely to make the land within the AoS unavailable to mineral operators under the likely assumption that landowners will not be prepared to deal with mineral operators if they perceive that future hope value will be adversely affected by mineral extraction. Policy statements therefore need to stress the strategic importance of retaining this land for aggregates extraction prior to the consideration of anything else. We therefore request that these five proposed housing sites should not go forward for consideration as housing or other allocations and should be labelled RED in the site assessment conclusions. The assessment text should be amended to state that any alternative development in the Methley Area of Search will severely compromise the LCC adopted strategy for aggregates provision, and that alternative uses will not be considered for allocation until all recoverable mineral has been extracted from the AoS, or that development can be shown not to adversely affect the mineral yield of this strategic resource area. In addition, we ask that any proposals for housing should be accompanied by a detailed and professional mineral assessment that shows the quantity, extent and quality of aggregate mineral present in the site, proposals for prior extraction, and the likely impact of development on the ability of adjacent areas to produce and transport mineral.

Name: Carol Hatton

Representor No: PRS04929

Representation ID: REP01061 Question Ref: H5

Wakefield Road coded 3112 and 3111. This should be recoded red, since again, it breaches the town's natural boarder and there is other more suitable land available. There would be an impact on the A642 in terms of increased traffic which would create a pinch-point at Town End junction and it could also increase flooding danger in Garforth. Also, sites 1224 and 3110 should not be coded amber, since the Garforth Cliff development at 823 has already impacted on drainage, soak-away and roads. The only access would be via the estate or onto the A63 at the pinch-point created by the 823 development. by the development at 823. These sites would be better red in the final plan.

Representation ID: REP01061 Question Ref: H9

As stated above, sites 1100, 1044, 3113, 1366, 3112, 3111, 1224 and 3110 should be coded red (and not amber or green). This is for the reasons I have identified previously - namely, traffic considerations, drainage, wildlife and the availability of other more suitable land.

Name: E Oldroyd & Sons (Lofthouse) Ltd

Representor No: PRS04978

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H4

Concerns over flooding issues low lying nature of 1224 & 1225 and reliance on pumping schemes to relieve long standing coal subsidence.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1224

Housing

Church Lane (land south of), Mickletown

Name: Mexborough Estates

Representor No: PRS06254

Representation ID: REP07166 Question Ref: H4

1224, 1225A, 1225C - objection to amber. Should be green.

In conclusion, it is therefore considered that the development of these 3 sites should be recognised as a priority and a preference for assisting with the achievement of the land supply for this Outer South housing market area. Whilst in the Green Belt, it is one of many Green Belt sites identified as possible for development in this wider locality and performs extremely well for removal from the Green Belt when tested against the 5 key tests for retention of land in the Green Belt. The sites are achievable, available and deliverable. Their promoter would welcome the opportunity to engage with the local community to bring the land forward and respond to their aspirations as far as is possible.

For additional detailed comments, see full representation.

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07466 Question Ref: H4

1224 -disagree should be red - see submitted representation for full detail

The lack of suitable access is a significant constraint in terms of being able to demonstrate developability.

Representation ID: REP07891 Question Ref: H5

1224 - The lack of suitable access is a significant constraint in terms of being able to demonstrate developability.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these sites were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible sites have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1225A

Housing

Pinfold Lane (land west of), Mickletown

Name: Malcolm Ratcliff

Representor No: PRS03887

Representation ID: REP06015 Question Ref: H4

Outer South Housing Sites 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B, 1225C

We wish to raise an objection to the possible identification of housing sites for the Outer South Area numbered 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B and 1225C on the grounds that such identification would severely compromise the mineral strategy for LCC adopted in January 2013.

A comparison of Plan 8.3 of the current consultation document with Plan 40 of the Adopted Natural Resources and Waste DPD (NRWDPD) shows that these sites sit squarely in the adopted Area of Search for Sand and Gravel (AoS). Any permanent development prior to the extraction of mineral in this AoS should be resisted for the following reasons,

1. Permanent housing development could sterilise substantial quantities of mineral. This could occur either directly because built development is erected over mineral resources, or indirectly by preventing extraction in adjacent areas through closing off access or by unacceptable environmental impacts.

2. The Methley Area of Search represents the LCC's provision for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates within the meaning of the term defined by NPPF paragraph 145 & MPS1 Practice Guide paragraphs 37 – 42. The site assessments for the housing proposals do not therefore do justice to the status of the AoS in the adopted Local Plan. They merely describe the constraint as a safeguarding issue, which it is not. The AoS is a land allocation in a recently adopted Local Plan and should not therefore be considered for an alternative allocation within the lifetime of that plan.

3. Any alternative allocation of land within the AoS will fatally compromise the LCC strategy for aggregates provision for the next 15 years. The only other site identified in LCC combined with available sites in other mineral planning authorities within West Yorkshire will not be sufficient to meet the forecast requirements for aggregates. Evidence provided by LCC officers at Examination of the NRWDPD indicates that the Methley AoS represents 38% of the total quantity of mineral remaining for aggregates extraction (under current constraints) within the whole of West Yorkshire. Without it the rest of the region cannot possibly meet the forecast demand. This will have several effects

a. It will increase pressure on constrained areas of LCC to provide the shortfall in aggregates, such as the valued landscape areas of the Wharfe valley.

b. It will increase pressure on other mpas, such as North Yorkshire, which are the nearest alternative area to meet the shortfall through the extension of existing sites or the replacement of exhausted sites.

c. It will increase carbon miles by unnecessarily cutting off the supply of sustainably sourced local materials, and relying on material travelling a great distance.

4. It is an axiom that minerals may only be worked where they occur (MPS1 Practice Guide paragraph 13). On the other hand, housing may be located anywhere (within reason and with the application of planning constraints). Minerals are also a scarce natural resource when considered in conjunction with the limited range of locations where their extraction may be acceptable environmentally. The Methley AoS is one of only two environmentally acceptable locations identified within the boundaries of LCC. Therefore, mineral extraction in this allocated area should take precedence over any other conflicting land use.

5. The Methley AoS is therefore a strategic resource of aggregates that should not be compromised by alternative land use proposals.

6. Any suggestion of future hope value for lucrative alternative land uses is very likely to make the land within the AoS unavailable to mineral operators under the likely assumption that landowners will not be prepared to deal with mineral operators if they perceive that future hope value will be adversely affected by mineral extraction. Policy statements therefore need to stress the strategic importance of retaining this land for aggregates extraction prior to the consideration of anything else.

We therefore request that these five proposed housing sites should not go forward for consideration as housing or other allocations and should be labelled RED in the site assessment conclusions. The assessment text should be amended to state that any alternative development in the Methley Area of Search will severely compromise the LCC adopted strategy for aggregates provision, and that alternative uses will not be considered for allocation until all recoverable mineral has been extracted from the AoS, or that development can be shown not to adversely affect the mineral yield of this strategic resource area. In addition, we ask that any proposals for housing should be accompanied by a detailed and professional mineral assessment that shows the quantity, extent and quality of aggregate mineral present in the site, proposals for prior extraction, and the likely impact of development on the ability of adjacent areas to produce and transport mineral.

Representation ID: REP01841 Question Ref: H5

Outer South Housing Sites 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B, 1225C - see separate sheets

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1225A

Housing

Pinfold Lane (land west of), Mickletown

Name: Malcolm Ratcliff

Representor No: PRS03887

Representation ID: REP01841 Question Ref: General comment

Outer South Housing Sites 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B, 1225C We wish to raise an objection to the possible identification of housing sites for the Outer South Area numbered 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B and 1225C on the grounds that such identification would severely compromise the mineral strategy for LCC adopted in January 2013. A comparison of Plan 8.3 of the current consultation document with Plan 40 of the Adopted Natural Resources and Waste DPD (NRWDPD) shows that these sites sit squarely in the adopted Area of Search for Sand and Gravel (AoS). Any permanent development prior to the extraction of mineral in this AoS should be resisted for the following reasons, 1. Permanent housing development could sterilise substantial quantities of mineral. This could occur either directly because built development is erected over mineral resources, or indirectly by preventing extraction in adjacent areas through closing off access or by unacceptable environmental impacts. 2. The Methley Area of Search represents the LCC's provision for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates within the meaning of the term defined by NPPF paragraph 145 & MPS1 Practice Guide paragraphs 37 – 42. The site assessments for the housing proposals do not therefore do justice to the status of the AoS in the adopted Local Plan. They merely describe the constraint as a safeguarding issue, which it is not. The AoS is a land allocation in a recently adopted Local Plan and should not therefore be considered for an alternative allocation within the lifetime of that plan. 3. Any alternative allocation of land within the AoS will fatally compromise the LCC strategy for aggregates provision for the next 15 years. The only other site identified in LCC combined with available sites in other mineral planning authorities within West Yorkshire will not be sufficient to meet the forecast requirements for aggregates. Evidence provided by LCC officers at Examination of the NRWDPD indicates that the Methley AoS represents 38% of the total quantity of mineral remaining for aggregates extraction (under current constraints) within the whole of West Yorkshire. Without it the rest of the region cannot possibly meet the forecast demand. This will have several effects a. It will increase pressure on constrained areas of LCC to provide the shortfall in aggregates, such as the valued landscape areas of the Wharfe valley. b. It will increase pressure on other mpas, such as North Yorkshire, which are the nearest alternative area to meet the shortfall through the extension of existing sites or the replacement of exhausted sites. c. It will increase carbon miles by unnecessarily cutting off the supply of sustainably sourced local materials, and relying on material travelling a great distance. 4. It is an axiom that minerals may only be worked where they occur (MPS1 Practice Guide paragraph 13). On the other hand, housing may be located anywhere (within reason and with the application of planning constraints). Minerals are also a scarce natural resource when considered in conjunction with the limited range of locations where their extraction may be acceptable environmentally. The Methley AoS is one of only two environmentally acceptable locations identified within the boundaries of LCC. Therefore, mineral extraction in this allocated area should take precedence over any other conflicting land use. 5. The Methley AoS is therefore a strategic resource of aggregates that should not be compromised by alternative land use proposals. 6. Any suggestion of future hope value for lucrative alternative land uses is very likely to make the land within the AoS unavailable to mineral operators under the likely assumption that landowners will not be prepared to deal with mineral operators if they perceive that future hope value will be adversely affected by mineral extraction. Policy statements therefore need to stress the strategic importance of retaining this land for aggregates extraction prior to the consideration of anything else. We therefore request that these five proposed housing sites should not go forward for consideration as housing or other allocations and should be labelled RED in the site assessment conclusions. The assessment text should be amended to state that any alternative development in the Methley Area of Search will severely compromise the LCC adopted strategy for aggregates provision, and that alternative uses will not be considered for allocation until all recoverable mineral has been extracted from the AoS, or that development can be shown not to adversely affect the mineral yield of this strategic resource area. In addition, we ask that any proposals for housing should be accompanied by a detailed and professional mineral assessment that shows the quantity, extent and quality of aggregate mineral present in the site, proposals for prior extraction, and the likely impact of development on the ability of adjacent areas to produce and transport mineral.

Name: E Oldroyd & Sons (Lofthouse) Ltd

Representor No: PRS04978

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H4

Concerns over flooding issues low lying nature of 1224 & 1225 and reliance on pumping schemes to relieve long standing coal subsidence.

Name: Mexborough Estates

Representor No: PRS06254

Representation ID: REP07166 Question Ref: H4

1224, 1225A, 1225C - objection to amber. Should be green.

In conclusion, it is therefore considered that the development of these 3 sites should be recognised as a priority and a preference for assisting with the achievement of the land supply for this Outer South housing market area. Whilst in the Green Belt, it is one of many Green Belt sites identified as possible for development in this wider locality and performs extremely well for removal from the Green Belt when tested against the 5 key tests for retention of land in the Green Belt. The sites are achievable, available and deliverable. Their promoter would welcome the opportunity to engage with the local community to bring the land forward and respond to their aspirations as far as is possible.

For additional detailed comments, see full representation.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1225A

Housing

Pinfold Lane (land west of), Mickletown

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07466 Question Ref: H4

1225

Representation ID: REP07891 Question Ref: H5

1225A - The only point of access is a narrow farm track from Pinfold Lane which would be unsuitable for residential development. The lack of suitable access is a significant constraint in terms of being able to demonstrate developability. The need to access the site through adjacent land presents deliverability questions. It is noted that the Site Assessment does not include an assessment of accessibility.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999

Representation ID: REP07421 Question Ref: H4

This site lies opposite the Methley Church Side 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. It also adjoins Harrison's Bridge 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 these assets are not harmed.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1225B

Housing

Pinfold Lane (land west of), Mickletown

Name: Daniel Johnston

Representor No: PRS03635

Representation ID: REP00694 Question Ref: H1

2. Most of the Aireborough sites are on greenfield, often Greenbelt land. Most of it is long-term pasture land, likely to have significant ecological value, while some of the sites (eg 1221) have mature hedgerows and trees. Site 1225B encroaches onto the edge of an area of particular local cultural value for the people of Yeadon and Guiseley and would have unacceptable visual impacts for existing residents, users of two very popular public footpaths and a registered village green at Yeadon Banks.

Representation ID: REP00694 Question Ref: H2

1225B - environmental impact, Greenbelt land, impact on infrastructure, visual impact

Name: Malcolm Ratcliff

Representor No: PRS03887

Representation ID: REP06015 Question Ref: H7

Outer South Housing Sites 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B, 1225C

We wish to raise an objection to the possible identification of housing sites for the Outer South Area numbered 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B and 1225C on the grounds that such identification would severely compromise the mineral strategy for LCC adopted in January 2013.

A comparison of Plan 8.3 of the current consultation document with Plan 40 of the Adopted Natural Resources and Waste DPD (NRWDPD) shows that these sites sit squarely in the adopted Area of Search for Sand and Gravel (AoS). Any permanent development prior to the extraction of mineral in this AoS should be resisted for the following reasons,

1. Permanent housing development could sterilise substantial quantities of mineral. This could occur either directly because built development is erected over mineral resources, or indirectly by preventing extraction in adjacent areas through closing off access or by unacceptable environmental impacts.

2. The Methley Area of Search represents the LCC's provision for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates within the meaning of the term defined by NPPF paragraph 145 & MPS1 Practice Guide paragraphs 37 – 42. The site assessments for the housing proposals do not therefore do justice to the status of the AoS in the adopted Local Plan. They merely describe the constraint as a safeguarding issue, which it is not. The AoS is a land allocation in a recently adopted Local Plan and should not therefore be considered for an alternative allocation within the lifetime of that plan.

3. Any alternative allocation of land within the AoS will fatally compromise the LCC strategy for aggregates provision for the next 15 years. The only other site identified in LCC combined with available sites in other mineral planning authorities within West Yorkshire will not be sufficient to meet the forecast requirements for aggregates. Evidence provided by LCC officers at Examination of the NRWDPD indicates that the Methley AoS represents 38% of the total quantity of mineral remaining for aggregates extraction (under current constraints) within the whole of West Yorkshire. Without it the rest of the region cannot possibly meet the forecast demand. This will have several effects

a. It will increase pressure on constrained areas of LCC to provide the shortfall in aggregates, such as the valued landscape areas of the Wharfe valley.

b. It will increase pressure on other mpas, such as North Yorkshire, which are the nearest alternative area to meet the shortfall through the extension of existing sites or the replacement of exhausted sites.

c. It will increase carbon miles by unnecessarily cutting off the supply of sustainably sourced local materials, and relying on material travelling a great distance.

4. It is an axiom that minerals may only be worked where they occur (MPS1 Practice Guide paragraph 13). On the other hand, housing may be located anywhere (within reason and with the application of planning constraints). Minerals are also a scarce natural resource when considered in conjunction with the limited range of locations where their extraction may be acceptable environmentally. The Methley AoS is one of only two environmentally acceptable locations identified within the boundaries of LCC. Therefore, mineral extraction in this allocated area should take precedence over any other conflicting land use.

5. The Methley AoS is therefore a strategic resource of aggregates that should not be compromised by alternative land use proposals.

6. Any suggestion of future hope value for lucrative alternative land uses is very likely to make the land within the AoS unavailable to mineral operators under the likely assumption that landowners will not be prepared to deal with mineral operators if they perceive that future hope value will be adversely affected by mineral extraction. Policy statements therefore need to stress the strategic importance of retaining this land for aggregates extraction prior to the consideration of anything else.

We therefore request that these five proposed housing sites should not go forward for consideration as housing or other allocations and should be labelled RED in the site assessment conclusions. The assessment text should be amended to state that any alternative development in the Methley Area of Search will severely compromise the LCC adopted strategy for aggregates provision, and that alternative uses will not be considered for allocation until all recoverable mineral has been extracted from the AoS, or that development can be shown not to adversely affect the mineral yield of this strategic resource area. In addition, we ask that any proposals for housing should be accompanied by a detailed and professional mineral assessment that shows the quantity, extent and quality of aggregate mineral present in the site, proposals for prior extraction, and the likely impact of development on the ability of adjacent areas to produce and transport mineral.

Name: E Oldroyd & Sons (Lofthouse) Ltd

Representor No: PRS04978

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H4

Concerns over flooding issues low lying nature of 1224 & 1225 and reliance on pumping schemes to relieve long standing coal subsidence.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1225B

Housing

Pinfold Lane (land west of), Mickletown

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1225C

Housing

Pinfold Lane (land west of), Mickletown

Name: Malcolm Ratcliff

Representor No: PRS03887

Representation ID: REP06015 Question Ref: H4

Outer South Housing Sites 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B, 1225C

We wish to raise an objection to the possible identification of housing sites for the Outer South Area numbered 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B and 1225C on the grounds that such identification would severely compromise the mineral strategy for LCC adopted in January 2013.

A comparison of Plan 8.3 of the current consultation document with Plan 40 of the Adopted Natural Resources and Waste DPD (NRWDPD) shows that these sites sit squarely in the adopted Area of Search for Sand and Gravel (AoS). Any permanent development prior to the extraction of mineral in this AoS should be resisted for the following reasons,

1. Permanent housing development could sterilise substantial quantities of mineral. This could occur either directly because built development is erected over mineral resources, or indirectly by preventing extraction in adjacent areas through closing off access or by unacceptable environmental impacts.

2. The Methley Area of Search represents the LCC's provision for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates within the meaning of the term defined by NPPF paragraph 145 & MPS1 Practice Guide paragraphs 37 – 42. The site assessments for the housing proposals do not therefore do justice to the status of the AoS in the adopted Local Plan. They merely describe the constraint as a safeguarding issue, which it is not. The AoS is a land allocation in a recently adopted Local Plan and should not therefore be considered for an alternative allocation within the lifetime of that plan.

3. Any alternative allocation of land within the AoS will fatally compromise the LCC strategy for aggregates provision for the next 15 years. The only other site identified in LCC combined with available sites in other mineral planning authorities within West Yorkshire will not be sufficient to meet the forecast requirements for aggregates. Evidence provided by LCC officers at Examination of the NRWDPD indicates that the Methley AoS represents 38% of the total quantity of mineral remaining for aggregates extraction (under current constraints) within the whole of West Yorkshire. Without it the rest of the region cannot possibly meet the forecast demand. This will have several effects

a. It will increase pressure on constrained areas of LCC to provide the shortfall in aggregates, such as the valued landscape areas of the Wharfe valley.

b. It will increase pressure on other mpas, such as North Yorkshire, which are the nearest alternative area to meet the shortfall through the extension of existing sites or the replacement of exhausted sites.

c. It will increase carbon miles by unnecessarily cutting off the supply of sustainably sourced local materials, and relying on material travelling a great distance.

4. It is an axiom that minerals may only be worked where they occur (MPS1 Practice Guide paragraph 13). On the other hand, housing may be located anywhere (within reason and with the application of planning constraints). Minerals are also a scarce natural resource when considered in conjunction with the limited range of locations where their extraction may be acceptable environmentally. The Methley AoS is one of only two environmentally acceptable locations identified within the boundaries of LCC. Therefore, mineral extraction in this allocated area should take precedence over any other conflicting land use.

5. The Methley AoS is therefore a strategic resource of aggregates that should not be compromised by alternative land use proposals.

6. Any suggestion of future hope value for lucrative alternative land uses is very likely to make the land within the AoS unavailable to mineral operators under the likely assumption that landowners will not be prepared to deal with mineral operators if they perceive that future hope value will be adversely affected by mineral extraction. Policy statements therefore need to stress the strategic importance of retaining this land for aggregates extraction prior to the consideration of anything else.

We therefore request that these five proposed housing sites should not go forward for consideration as housing or other allocations and should be labelled RED in the site assessment conclusions. The assessment text should be amended to state that any alternative development in the Methley Area of Search will severely compromise the LCC adopted strategy for aggregates provision, and that alternative uses will not be considered for allocation until all recoverable mineral has been extracted from the AoS, or that development can be shown not to adversely affect the mineral yield of this strategic resource area. In addition, we ask that any proposals for housing should be accompanied by a detailed and professional mineral assessment that shows the quantity, extent and quality of aggregate mineral present in the site, proposals for prior extraction, and the likely impact of development on the ability of adjacent areas to produce and transport mineral.

Representation ID: REP01841 Question Ref: H5

Outer South Housing Sites 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B, 1225C - see separate sheets

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1225C

Housing

Pinfold Lane (land west of), Mickletown

Name: Malcolm Ratcliff

Representor No: PRS03887

Representation ID: REP01841 Question Ref: General comment

Outer South Housing Sites 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B, 1225C We wish to raise an objection to the possible identification of housing sites for the Outer South Area numbered 1223, 1224, 1225A, 1225B and 1225C on the grounds that such identification would severely compromise the mineral strategy for LCC adopted in January 2013. A comparison of Plan 8.3 of the current consultation document with Plan 40 of the Adopted Natural Resources and Waste DPD (NRWDPD) shows that these sites sit squarely in the adopted Area of Search for Sand and Gravel (AoS). Any permanent development prior to the extraction of mineral in this AoS should be resisted for the following reasons, 1. Permanent housing development could sterilise substantial quantities of mineral. This could occur either directly because built development is erected over mineral resources, or indirectly by preventing extraction in adjacent areas through closing off access or by unacceptable environmental impacts. 2. The Methley Area of Search represents the LCC's provision for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates within the meaning of the term defined by NPPF paragraph 145 & MPS1 Practice Guide paragraphs 37 – 42. The site assessments for the housing proposals do not therefore do justice to the status of the AoS in the adopted Local Plan. They merely describe the constraint as a safeguarding issue, which it is not. The AoS is a land allocation in a recently adopted Local Plan and should not therefore be considered for an alternative allocation within the lifetime of that plan. 3. Any alternative allocation of land within the AoS will fatally compromise the LCC strategy for aggregates provision for the next 15 years. The only other site identified in LCC combined with available sites in other mineral planning authorities within West Yorkshire will not be sufficient to meet the forecast requirements for aggregates. Evidence provided by LCC officers at Examination of the NRWDPD indicates that the Methley AoS represents 38% of the total quantity of mineral remaining for aggregates extraction (under current constraints) within the whole of West Yorkshire. Without it the rest of the region cannot possibly meet the forecast demand. This will have several effects a. It will increase pressure on constrained areas of LCC to provide the shortfall in aggregates, such as the valued landscape areas of the Wharfe valley. b. It will increase pressure on other mpas, such as North Yorkshire, which are the nearest alternative area to meet the shortfall through the extension of existing sites or the replacement of exhausted sites. c. It will increase carbon miles by unnecessarily cutting off the supply of sustainably sourced local materials, and relying on material travelling a great distance. 4. It is an axiom that minerals may only be worked where they occur (MPS1 Practice Guide paragraph 13). On the other hand, housing may be located anywhere (within reason and with the application of planning constraints). Minerals are also a scarce natural resource when considered in conjunction with the limited range of locations where their extraction may be acceptable environmentally. The Methley AoS is one of only two environmentally acceptable locations identified within the boundaries of LCC. Therefore, mineral extraction in this allocated area should take precedence over any other conflicting land use. 5. The Methley AoS is therefore a strategic resource of aggregates that should not be compromised by alternative land use proposals. 6. Any suggestion of future hope value for lucrative alternative land uses is very likely to make the land within the AoS unavailable to mineral operators under the likely assumption that landowners will not be prepared to deal with mineral operators if they perceive that future hope value will be adversely affected by mineral extraction. Policy statements therefore need to stress the strategic importance of retaining this land for aggregates extraction prior to the consideration of anything else. We therefore request that these five proposed housing sites should not go forward for consideration as housing or other allocations and should be labelled RED in the site assessment conclusions. The assessment text should be amended to state that any alternative development in the Methley Area of Search will severely compromise the LCC adopted strategy for aggregates provision, and that alternative uses will not be considered for allocation until all recoverable mineral has been extracted from the AoS, or that development can be shown not to adversely affect the mineral yield of this strategic resource area. In addition, we ask that any proposals for housing should be accompanied by a detailed and professional mineral assessment that shows the quantity, extent and quality of aggregate mineral present in the site, proposals for prior extraction, and the likely impact of development on the ability of adjacent areas to produce and transport mineral.

Name: E Oldroyd & Sons (Lofthouse) Ltd

Representor No: PRS04978

Representation ID: REP00712 Question Ref: H4

Concerns over flooding issues low lying nature of 1224 & 1225 and reliance on pumping schemes to relieve long standing coal subsidence.

Name: Mexborough Estates

Representor No: PRS06254

Representation ID: REP07166 Question Ref: H4

1224, 1225A, 1225C - objection to amber. Should be green.

In conclusion, it is therefore considered that the development of these 3 sites should be recognised as a priority and a preference for assisting with the achievement of the land supply for this Outer South housing market area. Whilst in the Green Belt, it is one of many Green Belt sites identified as possible for development in this wider locality and performs extremely well for removal from the Green Belt when tested against the 5 key tests for retention of land in the Green Belt. The sites are achievable, available and deliverable. Their promoter would welcome the opportunity to engage with the local community to bring the land forward and respond to their aspirations as far as is possible.

For additional detailed comments, see full representation.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1225C

Housing

Pinfold Lane (land west of), Mickletown

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07466 Question Ref: H4

1225C - disagree should be red - see submitted representation for full details

The lack of suitable access is a significant constraint in terms of being able to demonstrate developability. The need to access the site through adjacent land presents deliverability questions. Furthermore, it is not evident that suitable access can be secured from Church Lane for site 1224.

Representation ID: REP07891 Question Ref: H5

1225C - The lack of suitable access is a significant constraint in terms of being able to demonstrate developability. The need to access the site through adjacent land presents deliverability questions. Furthermore, it is not evident that suitable access can be secured from Church Lane for site 1224.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1249

Housing

Junction 30 M62 (land off), Rothwell and Oulton LS26

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: General comment

Wakefield Road Sieved out/Support

Name: Charles Offord

Representor No: PRS04171

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H10

site not on the map off the A642 between site reference 1249 and the current housing development.

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H11

1365a move to short term 1365b move to medium term new site next to site 1249 on A642 short

Name: D.j Cove

Representor No: PRS05192

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: General comment

1249 - Agree with Purple

We agree with Site Allocations Plan that this site should not be allocated for housing.

It is outside settlement hierarchy and in Green Belt. It has important landscape value. We strongly support its exclusion.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1259A

Housing

Bullough Lane - Haigh Farm (land adjacent to), Rothwell Haigh LS26 0JY

Name: Barratt & David Wilson Homes Yorkshire West

Representor No: PRS05643

Representation ID: REP07244 Question Ref: H7

1259A - objection to red. Should be green.

We object to the rating of site reference 1259B as Amber (sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites) and 1259A as Red (sites not considered suitable to allocate for housing). We believe both sites should be allocated as green in the Site Allocations Plan.

We disagree with Leeds City Council's assessments in relation to the accessibility of this site, which states that it fails to meet the accessibility standards with regard to primary education, health care and employment. Our own assessment has identified that the site is within a 15 minute walk of Rothwell Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School. All of 1259A meets the accessibility standard for healthcare facilities, and the majority of 1259B meets the standard. With regard to access to employment opportunities, there are 6 buses per hour into Leeds city centre from the bus stops on Leeds Road. This exceeds the Leeds City Council standard. The Leeds City Council assessment also fails to take into account the local employment opportunities available within South Leeds; there are a number of employment areas to the north west of Rothwell including the Aire Valley Enterprise Zone, and additionally to the south west of the site on Leeds Road. Rothwell is also close to an identified Strategic Location for Job Growth in the draft Core Strategy. Therefore this site should be looked on favourably with regard to locating housing near existing and future jobs.

The site is on the edge of the major settlement of Rothwell in the Outer South housing market area where a significant proportion of growth is encouraged through the Core Strategy therefore the development of site is compliant with the emerging strategic policies. The Outer South housing market area is apportioned 2,600 dwellings over the plan period. The draft Site Allocations Plan identifies 175 dwellings from outstanding planning permissions and housing allocations, and 1,211 dwellings from sites rated as 'Green'. Combined this totals 1,386 dwellings and is insufficient to meet the draft housing requirement, therefore a number of sites assessed as 'Amber' or 'Red' will be necessary to allocate to meet the identified need for this market area.

Based on draft Spatial Policy 7, we consider that Rothwell should receive up to circa 2,200 dwellings based on its position as the only major settlement in the Outer South market area. Based on the Council's assessment, in Rothwell 21 dwellings are identified from outstanding planning permissions, 639 dwellings from 'Green' sites and 5 1,026 from 'Amber' sites which is a total of 1,686. If the Council are to allocate anything over 1,686 homes in Rothwell (which as a major settlement would conform with their strategy) they would need all of the 'Amber' sites and potentially some of the 'Red' sites.

Leeds City Council acknowledge that part of the site is well related to the existing settlement layout and its development will be contained by the park to the north. The development of the site could provide opportunities to connect existing residential areas with Rothwell Country Park. The site should be seen as a comprehensive development site, and not split into two sections of A and B. The Development Masterplan identifies the land immediately to the north of dwellings on Temple Court, Brinsmead Court and Rosewood Court as greenspace, and the land to the west of Bullough Lane is identified for potential future development. The site has the potential to deliver circa 224 dwellings, new areas of open space and new footpath links. The site offers a logical extension to the current urban form and removal for the Green Belt.

The site access has been investigated by a highways consultant and this can be provided and delivered so is not to be considered a constraint to the sites development.

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 of 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 further comments, see full representation including promotional document.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1259A

Housing

Bullough Lane - Haigh Farm (land adjacent to), Rothwell Haigh LS26 0JY

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H7

1259A Agree Red - see full submitted representation for details.

This greenfield site is considered generally unsuitable for development as it is isolated from the main settlement hierarchy and any potential housing allocation could lead to urban sprawl into the Greenbelt. The site is also irregular and disjointed as it straddles a belt identified as Natural Greenspace in the Open Space Audit, which reflects the line of the Dismantled Railway located just to the west of Bullough Lane.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1259B

Housing

Bullough Lane - Haigh Farm (land adjacent to), Rothwell Haigh LS26 0JY

Name: Joanna Hammond

Representor No: PRS03296

Representation ID: REP01403 Question Ref: H3

1259B New houses would bring a new lease of life to this area. Easier access to amenities

Name: Barratt & David Wilson Homes Yorkshire West

Representor No: PRS05643

Representation ID: REP07244 Question Ref: H4

1259B - objection to amber. Should be green.

We object to the rating of site reference 1259B as Amber (sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites) and 1259A as Red (sites not considered suitable to allocate for housing). We believe both sites should be allocated as green in the Site Allocations Plan.

We disagree with Leeds City Council's assessments in relation to the accessibility of this site, which states that it fails to meet the accessibility standards with regard to primary education, health care and employment. Our own assessment has identified that the site is within a 15 minute walk of Rothwell Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School. All of 1259A meets the accessibility standard for healthcare facilities, and the majority of 1259B meets the standard. With regard to access to employment opportunities, there are 6 buses per hour into Leeds city centre from the bus stops on Leeds Road. This exceeds the Leeds City Council standard. The Leeds City Council assessment also fails to take into the account the local employment opportunities available within South Leeds; there are a number of employment areas to the north west of Rothwell including the Aire Valley Enterprise Zone, and additionally to the south west of the site on Leeds Road. Rothwell is also close to an identified Strategic Location for Job Growth in the draft Core Strategy. Therefore this site should be looked on favourably with regard to locating housing near existing and future jobs.

The site is on the edge of the major settlement of Rothwell in the Outer South housing market area where a significant proportion of growth is encouraged through the Core Strategy therefore the development of site is compliant with the emerging strategic policies. The Outer South housing market area is apportioned 2,600 dwellings over the plan period. The draft Site Allocations Plan identifies 175 dwellings from outstanding planning permissions and housing allocations, and 1,211 dwellings from sites rated as 'Green'. Combined this totals 1,386 dwellings and is insufficient to meet the draft housing requirement, therefore a number of sites assessed as 'Amber' or 'Red' will be necessary to allocate to meet the identified need for this market area.

Based on draft Spatial Policy 7, we consider that Rothwell should receive up to circa 2,200 dwellings based on its position as the only major settlement in the Outer South market area. Based on the Council's assessment, in Rothwell 21 dwellings are identified from outstanding planning permissions, 639 dwellings from 'Green' sites and 5 1,026 from 'Amber' sites which is a total of 1,686. If the Council are to allocate anything over 1,686 homes in Rothwell (which as a major settlement would conform with their strategy) they would need all of the 'Amber' sites and potentially some of the 'Red' sites.

Leeds City Council acknowledge that part of the site is well related to the existing settlement layout and its development will be contained by the park to the north. The development of the site could provide opportunities to connect existing residential areas with Rothwell Country Park. The site should be seen as a comprehensive development site, and not split into two sections of A and B. The Development Masterplan identifies the land immediately to the north of dwellings on Temple Court, Brinsmead Court and Rosewood Court as greenspace, and the land to the west of Bullough Lane is identified for potential future development. The site has the potential to deliver circa 224 dwellings, new areas of open space and new footpath links. The site offers a logical extension to the current urban form and removal for the Green Belt.

The site access has been investigated by a highways consultant and this can be provided and delivered so is not to be considered a constraint to the sites development.

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 of 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 further comments, see full representation including promotional document.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1259B

Housing

Bullough Lane - Haigh Farm (land adjacent to), Rothwell Haigh LS26 0JY

Name: Mark Jones

Representor No: PRS06012

Representation ID: REP06839 Question Ref: H4

LEEDS SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN - ISSUES AND OPTIONS PUBLIC CONSULTATION

I write with regard to Leeds City Council Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options issued in June 2013 for public consultation and specifically in connection with the 'Outer South' plan.

I object to Site 1259B as a potential housing site on the following grounds:

- The site lies within the Green Belt, is only surrounded by a built up area to one side and there are other less sensitive sites that could accommodate the housing growth required in the Outer South area.

- The site lies in between a bridleway, which runs along the southern boundary of the site and the Rothwell Country Park to the north. Thus, the site extends too far to the east and will have a detrimental impact on both of these, in particular the latter.

I support the inclusion of Site 148 as natural green space for reasons I set out later.

I am concerned that Leeds City Council (LCC) have said that this site could be a potential housing site because it would be contained by the park to the north. This park is the Rothwell County Park that is currently allocated in the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006 (UDP) as a Local Nature Area and is being proposed by LCC as a Natural Greenspace (which I support). Recently LCC have spent considerable amounts of money enhancing the Park by introducing a 'Trim Trail' demonstrating how popular and how well used this local asset is. It also signifies how important LCC (as a whole - not just the planning department) consider this site to be.

Along with its ecological benefits, one of the fundamental and unique characteristics of the RCP is its topography, as it comprises of a very large hill. This means that it is a very prominent, visible and elevated area of land. Its height means that when standing on top of it, people have panoramic views of Leeds and there are a number of high buildings within Leeds City Centre from which you can see a large part of the RCP. The views from the bridleway, other surrounding footpaths and from the RCP itself would be severely harmed by any housing located on Site 1259B. The bulk and massing of such development at the foot of the hill adjacent to the RCP would have a devastating visual impact on the setting and character of it and it would be very visible from the public footpaths and bridleways adjoining it.

RCP is a very important nature site that needs protecting. It comprises of an extensive network of paths including a 'sculpture trail' and 'pond trail' and in 2010 the Friends of Rothwell Country Park were set up to help manage the park for both people and wildlife.

It is accessed from the Trans-Pennine Cycle Way and is located adjacent to the Aire and Calder Navigation Canal. It is part of a corridor of green spaces in the Lower Aire Valley that is owned by Leeds City Council and managed in partnership with the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust.

In addition to the above mentioned, there is currently a strong defensible boundary between Site 1259B and the built up area to the south. A fundamental part of the existing strong boundary is the public footpath which benefits from well established trees and hedgerows, is very popular and is well used to gain access to the RCP.

To my knowledge, Site 1259B is Grade 3 agricultural land whereas there appears to be other alternative Green Belt sites that are of lower agricultural quality in the area.

The site does play a role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and to protect the setting of the adjacent local nature site. Site 1259B is not well connected to the built up area and does not have two or more boundaries with an existing built up area. Nor does it appear to benefit from a sufficient amount of access points to support a housing development of this scale.

Overall Site 1259B based on the size and extent of the site area is too large and would have a severe impact upon the Green Belt and immediately adjacent natural greenspace areas, in particular Rothwell County Park. I therefore wish to object to Site 1259B and request that the Council continues to reject this site as a potential housing site in the emerging Site Allocations Plan. I also request that the Council continues to protect the very important RCP as a proposed Natural Greenspace and continue to afford it protection as is currently the case in the current Leeds UDP.

Please could you keep me informed of any future opportunities to engage in the Site Allocations process and any other emerging documents which will have an impact on the 'Outer South' area.

[x]

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H7

1259B Agree Amber - see full submitted representation for details.

This greenfield site could be considered as fairly acceptable for potential housing allocation, if needed. However, it is considered that the western boundary should only extend up to Bullough Lane, which would help retain a belt identified as Natural Greenspace in the Open Space Audit which reflects the line of the Dismantled Railway located just to the west of Bullough Lane. We would also recommend that the existing tree/hedge line along the south boundary be maintained and also extended along the whole length of this boundary, in order to provide a visible green separation to the existing settlements and help mitigate the impact and encroachment into the Greenbelt.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1259B

Housing

Bullough Lane - Haigh Farm (land adjacent to), Rothwell Haigh LS26 0JY

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - amber sites are linked to this comment]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1261

Housing

Church Farm and surrounding land north of M62, Lofthouse WF3 3SA

Name: Colin Dawson

Representor No: PRS03138

Representation ID: REP01515 Question Ref: H14

1261 could be developed for use by the elderly providing there was an expansion of the Lofthouse surgery. This is a quiet rural area suitable for the needs of the elderly who appreciate peace and quiet. Also an area dedicated to that use could be "custom built" to provide for their needs.

Name: Janet Dobson

Representor No: PRS03431

Representation ID: REP01994 Question Ref: H4

1261. 3088 Not suitable re access and over development Both give rise to Urban Sprawl not suitable

Name: Amanda Thompson

Representor No: PRS04439

Representation ID: REP00942 Question Ref: H5

map 29 reference 1261 do not agree with this site being developed as there are limited access points as it runs next to the m62. There is a historic dismantled railway running through this site which would harm not only the site itself but also the flora and fauna that live here. There is a large site (3085) that has been selected for development which would surpass the housing that we need for this area. What about the amenities and schools for all these houses.

Representation ID: REP00942 Question Ref: H9

i think that site map 29 reference 1261 should be coded red as there are issues with its closeness to the m62. Access issues and also the importance of the historic railway that runs through the site. Not to mention the native trees that live along this railway site

Representation ID: REP00942 Question Ref: H11

Map 29 reference 1261 feel that this site if all issues are resolved should be developed in the long term. The green sites in this map 29 make up for more than enough housing

Representation ID: REP00942 Question Ref: H2

map 29 reference 1261 do not agree with this proposed site as it is situated next to the m62 with very poor access into and from. This area is a natural barrier from the motorway. There is a historical disused railway running through this area which is home to many native trees and wildlife. Our community is limited for schools and amenities and with the proposed green site (3085) allocated for housing i feel that no more is required in our immediate area.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1261

Housing

Church Farm and surrounding land north of M62, Lofthouse WF3 3SA

Name: Jonathan Westwood

Representor No: PRS04689

Representation ID: REP01517 Question Ref: H3

Site Ref 1261 - See attached letter

Representation ID: REP06877 Question Ref: H4

RE: Draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document- Site Ref 1261

I am writing to comment on the above site in your current consultations. The Westwood family has owned and farmed this land for generations, and we are very much a part of the area in so many ways. We are local employers, we live locally and we share in the lives of many people in Lofthouse. Our children have gone to school here and some of us can remember the times before the Motorways divided our land. We very much feel that we have a stake in the future of the area and hope that our views will be heard.

This particular land has over the years been almost completely enclosed by housing development, as Lofthouse has expanded southwards towards the M62 motorway. This in itself has brought problems and we now regularly receive complaints from neighbouring properties about nuisances such as dust caused by our cultivation of the land. The motorway has already prevented any further spread of housing and is an obvious boundary to restrict new development should this be allowed. As Green Belt it probably now serves little purpose and if Leeds needs room to grow, as we are told it does, then this site can easily be made available. It seems logical now to expand Lofthouse into this well enclosed area and to round off the village.

With any proposals put forward in relation to our land we would always consider the wider implication on the community as a whole, and would want to give something back to the community if the site is released for development. It is public knowledge that the current doctors surgery at Church Farm Close is in need of major improvements and patient parking has been problematic for a number of years. The community is expanding and clearly the current practice would find difficulty dealing with increased patient numbers in the future. We understand Lofthouse is earmarked for further growth and as such improved Care facilities would benefit the community a great deal. To this end our late father had hoped that one day, as part of a development, we might provide a new medical centre to replace Church Farm Close Surgery. We now believe that release of the site would allow this and we would be more than willing to accommodate these new facilities at no cost to the current practitioners, bearing the cost in order to assist the community and to benefit future generations. Development of the site offers this excellent opportunity and it would of course mean a great deal to the Westwood family knowing this could be achieved.

We also know that the population of Lofthouse is growing older; we are many of us are living into ripe old age and need caring for. We would therefore wish to see a development that reflects and considers the elderly as part of any plans for the site. You should find that the proposals put forward by the Oakapple Group accord with our wishes.

Oakapple is a Leeds based Development Company, and the family has known the directors for a number of years and trusts their judgement. We have agreed that they will buy the site subject to contract and see that our wishes are respected should the land be released for development.

If you need any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Representation ID: REP01517 Question Ref: H11

See attached letter - Site ref 1261 available short term

Representation ID: REP01517 Question Ref: H14

See attached letter Site Ref 1261

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1261

Housing

Church Farm and surrounding land north of M62, Lofthouse WF3 3SA

Name: Karen Nicholson

Representor No: PRS04805

Representation ID: REP01305 Question Ref: General comment

Dear Sir/Madam CONSULTATION ON ISSUES AND OPTIONS FOR LEEDS SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN – Church Farm and surrounding land north of M62, Lofthouse, Wakefield, WF3 3SA Site Ref: 1261 We wish to support allocation of this site for residential development and believe the needs of the local community would be well served if it is allowed to proceed. We understand from professionals, working with the land owners, that on technical grounds the site is eminently suitable. Our own interest is in the health needs of the local population, most of whom are on our patient list and therefore our responsibility. In short, if the development goes ahead, not only will the development provide new homes for the patients of Lofthouse, but also new a new purpose built surgery allowing us to, improve/expand the services we offer. Our current building is ageing and we would very much like to expand but we cannot due to site constraints. Current constraints on NHS spending mean that this would not be possible using NHS support. However, the land owner, who has sadly now passed away, gave a commitment to help relocate our Practice onto a new site. The family wish to honour this commitment and help us build a new surgery as part of the scheme should the land be released for development. In summary therefore development of the site for new homes would help promote the health of the Lofthouse community in every way, and we very much hope it will be supported by the Council. [x]

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H4

1261 Church Farm etc – I disagree with the designation of this site. It should be Red. The site is Green Belt, is currently in agricultural use and forms an important part of the famous Rhubarb Triangle. There is no suitable access point. Only two possible access points – one of which is currently in employment use, the other would result in significant additional vehicle movements through Church Farm Croft exiting out onto the A61 by the Doctors Surgery. This is already a difficult junction due to the parking generated by the surgery and neighbouring Church. Neither access point would be suitable for the volume of traffic housing on this scale would generate.

Name: Karen Renshaw

Representor No: PRS06048

Representation ID: REP06876 Question Ref: H4

Site 1261 - Amber to Red

I wish to make some formal objections to the proposals set out in the documents regarding the site allocation plans.

- Church Farm , WF3 3SA – 1261 Proposal to build 144 houses
- Hope Farm - 3081 Part A & B Proposal to build 279 properties
- The Grange -3085 Proposal to build 234 homes
- Leadwell Lane - 3445A Proposed 60 properties

The above sites are within the Rothwell side of Ardsley & Robin Hood. All the schools within this area are already full to their capacity and some are already being extended. The infrastructure has already been over accommodating and the amenities within this region of the Ward are insufficient to facilitate current residents. Due to recent development work the roads have become busier and safety elements have had to be implemented. It is a sad situation when local residents cannot attend their local schools and yet the transport cannot accommodate the alternatives given. The green space is a key feature, that which is left and it is an area valued by all within this community.

The increase in traffic, noise , pollution as well as the damage to our environment, removing historical elements and eliminating the rhubarb triangle would be detrimental to health and well-being of local residents. This would impact on our young children who already struggle to get appointments at our local GP's

I strongly oppose the above proposals and hope that these aspects, along with those of local residents who managed to be informed of this process, will be considered before any decisions are made.

Name: Carlton Neighbourhood Association

Representor No: PRS06375

Representation ID: REP07379 Question Ref: H4

1261 Should be green with conditions - see submitted representation for full details

This site is Green Belt site but well contained between motorway and existing settlement, so impact on the purposes of Green Belt is minimal.

Access has the potential to be gained via either existing industrial buildings that could also be a brownfield development site, or less appropriately via Church Farm Close to the West.

The CVRA considers this site may be appropriate for development providing that the means of access was resolved, ideally via the industrial units to the East of the site. If this means of access was secured then the impact of traffic on Ouzlewell Green should be reduced as Castle Gate provides direct access to the A642 and M62

See Appendix C for an image of the site.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1261

Housing

Church Farm and surrounding land north of M62, Lofthouse WF3 3SA

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07466 Question Ref: H4

1261 - Disagree should be red - see submitted representation for full details

The lack of suitable access is a significant constraint in terms of being able to demonstrate developability and the need to access the site through adjacent land presents deliverability questions. It is noted that the Council's Highway department do not support the site.

Representation ID: REP07891 Question Ref: H5

1261 - The lack of suitable access is a significant constraint in terms of being able to demonstrate developability and the need to access the site through adjacent land presents deliverability questions. It is noted that the Council's Highway department do not support the site.

Name: Justin Coley

Representor No: PRS06448

Representation ID: REP07524 Question Ref: H4

SITE1261 Church Farm and surrounding Land, Lofthouse

This site is Green Belt site but well contained between motorway and existing settlement, so impact on the purposes of Green Belt is minimal. Access has the potential to be gained via either existing industrial buildings that could also be a brownfield development site, or less appropriately via Church Farm Close to the West.

The CVRA considers this site may be appropriate for development providing that the means of access was resolved, ideally via the industrial units to the East of the site. If this means of access was secured then the impact of traffic on Ouzlewell Green should be reduced as Castle Gate provides direct access to the A642 and M62

See Appendix C for an image of the site. (See Scanned Documents for this image)

Representation ID: REP07524 Question Ref: H10

Appendix C – Details SAP site 1261, the potential access ways to it and also a site that the CVRA asks the Council to consider for use as a Brownfield site for residential development and is currently occupied by industrial units.

Representation ID: REP07529 Question Ref: E4

Employment Issues

There are no opportunities for a major employment site within the CVRAs area. However, the size of SAP site 1261 may allow for the building of a shop or public house that could bring some employment opportunity.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1261

Housing

Church Farm and surrounding land north of M62, Lofthouse WF3 3SA

Name: Oakapple Homes

Representor No: PRS06500

Representation ID: REP07633 Question Ref: H3

1261

Should be colour coded green. Oakapple Homes is part of the Oakapple Group; a Leeds based developer with particular expertise in residential and community based development, including Medical/Healthcare. WYG made a submission to Leeds City Council in August 2012 on behalf of Oakapple, setting out why it is considered that land at site 1261 does not contribute to the reasons for inclusion of land within the Green Belt. [The representation is supported by a series of site drawings, layout plan etc].

The site at Lofthouse is located off Church Farm Close. It is currently used as agricultural land. The developable area measures 6.3ha (15.5 acres). The area outlined in red, with the exception of a small part of the site to the North, is entirely within the Green Belt. The area not within the Green Belt is within the built up area and is classed as white land. Oakapple has an agreement with the land owners, including the proposed means of access to the site. It should be noted that the land which includes the warehouses to the north eastern boundary of the site is not required to unlock the land for development, and is not included within this representation.

The site immediately adjoins, and shares boundaries with, the built up area to the north and west. To the north east, the site also adjoins housing, but is separated by an abandoned railway, now overgrown with a band of trees. The M62 is to the south of the site. As outlined above, the area in red is predominantly within the designated Green Belt and outside of the development limit and is also designated as an Urban Fringe Priority Area. The site is within Flood Zone 1. There is an overhead power line which crosses the site, but which can be relocated to allow development under a Wayleave Agreement

WYG agrees with the Council observations regarding the Green Belt and the conclusion that releasing land from the Green Belt for housing would have minimal impact. For completeness we have included our summary table submitted to Leeds City Council last year.

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - The development of the site would not constitute ribbon development. Established residential streets restrict the site extending to the north, east and west. The M62 motorway is to the south. As such, the site is not remote from the built up area and it would form a sensible extension to the existing built up area. The site is well connected to the built up area, which is residential in character. The development of the site would fulfil the role "rounding off" this part of the Lofthouse settlement. Due to the location of the site within the context of this part of Lofthouse, the site would round off the settlement and would not give rise to the coalescence of settlements. In conclusion, and in accordance with the assessment criteria there is low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl.
2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging - It is impossible to define a minimum distance that there should be between settlements. The important consideration is whether development would appear to result in the merger of built up areas. Topography and features such as rivers and major roads can act as barriers preventing merging. As set out above, the site is contained by existing buildings and infrastructure which would not allow the parcel of land extending in any direction. The redevelopment of the land would be contained to the boundaries shown on the plan above. There are other areas of Green Belt between Lofthouse and other settlements to prevent coalescence of settlements. The conclusion therefore is that development of the site would not result in merging of settlements.
3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - There is no defensible boundaries between the site and the urban area. The parcel of land does not contribute to the role and function of the Green Belt and releasing it from the Green Belt designation would not compromise the purpose of Green Belt land. As set out in the above column, the site is surrounded on all sides by physical barriers which would prevent extending the site any further. As the site is surrounded by buildings and infrastructure, it does not provide any form of access to the open countryside. There are no public rights of way, footpaths or bridle ways that cross the land. There are no national or local nature conservation sites on, or within the vicinity of the site. The site does play host to 2 large areas of trees, one to the north east, acting as a barrier between the site and residents on Green Bank and the trees that separate the site from the M62 to the south. As these are established areas of planting they will be considered in the context of development in the future. The site is currently used for agricultural purposes. In accordance with DEFRA's MAGIC maps, the land is identified as Grade 3 land and therefore it is not land which provides high quality agricultural land. There are no buildings within the red line area. There is however an overhead power line which bisects the site. In conclusion the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns - This site is not within, or adjacent to a conservation area. There are no listed buildings or heritage assets on site, or within close proximity that would need to be taken into consideration. In conclusion development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features.
5. Assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land - Not considered here.

It is clear from the table above that the site does not perform any Green Belt function. Furthermore, this site adjoins the built up area and is therefore well connected to the Lofthouse settlement and access to local services, facilities and public transport is excellent. The Council acknowledge in the Draft Site Allocations DPD that the release of the land would have minimal impact on the Green Belt.

We do however refute the Council's conclusion that there is no suitable access at present. A transport statement has been undertaken by HY Consulting based on suitable means of access, and where Agreements exist between Oakapple and the landowners. A copy of this report can be made available on request, however for ease of reference we have summarised the highways findings below.

Highways - The transport statement prepared by HY Consulting confirms that access to the site will be achieved via two separate points; one at Green Bank to the north of the site, the other at Church Farm Close to the west of the site (these are detailed on Plan 3207(1)003). The northern site access will extend the present length of Green Bank which will bend south and pass between 19 and 22 Green Bank and into the site crossing the abandoned railway. This spine road will pass around a central green space before continuing west to join Church Farm close, which will be extended. A series of loop roads off this spine road will provide access to dwellings and other uses on site.

We are therefore able to conclude that based on the assessment of the Green Belt criteria, it is appropriate to remove the land out of the Green Belt to deliver housing and community benefits. The release of the site would effectively "round off" the settlement. Furthermore, the Council assumption that the land relies on the delivery of third party land to achieve access is incorrect.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1261

Housing

Church Farm and surrounding land north of M62, Lofthouse WF3 3SA

Name: Oakapple Homes

Representor No: PRS06500

In response to question H6 there should be no reason why the land at 1261 cannot be reclassified as a "green" site and be allocated for housing, as access can be achieved without third party land.

In order to consider the contribution that the site can make to the housing land supply, an indicative site layout plan has been prepared to consider how the land could come forward for development and this is attached for the Council's information (Plan Ref 3207(1)010D). There have been a number of technical issues to take into consideration and reports have been prepared. We have not included these reports with this submission; however they can be made available on request. For ease we have summarised these below.

Quantum of Development - The indicative site layout shows that the site can be developed to provide 210 dwellings, which comprises 189 houses (2, 3 and 4 bedroom) and 21 apartments (1 bedroom). The mix of house types is considered acceptable for this location which is popular with family type accommodation. The site also allows for a 60 unit Continuing Care Retirement Community, identified as an essential local need to meet the demands of the growing number of older people living in Lofthouse. The layout also provides accommodation for a new medical centre for the Church Farm Close Medical Practice. This has been included as the original land owner, who has now passed away, wished to provide the local community with a new doctor's surgery. As the land is still within the ownership of the family, they intend to respect his wishes and fulfil the promise made. Church Farm Close Medical Practice will be submitting a letter in support of the allocation of this site for housing and their new surgery. The site has been laid out to reflect the local vernacular; this in turn has helped inform the density of development which is commensurate with those residential streets which surround the site.

Transport - As set out above, access can be achieved via Green Bank and Church Farm Close. The transport statement prepared to support this site promotion provides details of highways impact. It is concluded "there are no particular road safety or capacity issues that could reasonably be raised as a result of this increase in traffic when compared to nationally accepted guidance". The transport statement also considers sustainable transport. There are several bus stops within 400m of the site; Green Lane, Ouzlewell Green and on the A61 (south of the junction with Church Farm Close). The stops at Green Lane and Ouzlewell Green provide access to service 153 which provides a route to Morley, Rothwell and Castleford and the 444 which runs between Leeds, Wakefield and Hall Green. The stop on the A61 provides access to the 110 service which is a route between Leeds and Wakefield. The bus services outlined above also provide direct access to both Leeds and Wakefield Train Stations. Looking at provision for pedestrians, footways are provided on either side of the principle roads surrounding the site. Both Green Lane and Ouzlewell Green are designated as advisory cycle routes on the Leeds Cycle Map.

Sustainability - The site is well connected to the existing built up area of Lofthouse. There is a plan submitted with this representation to show the site within the context of the surrounding area and existing facilities and services (Plan Ref 3207(1)006). [A table in representation provides further detail.]

Noise - The southern boundary of the site is adjacent to the M62. In recognition of the site's proximity to this principle road, it is acknowledged that it is necessary to consider the impact that noise may have on the developable area of the site. As such, a noise assessment has been prepared by WYG and concludes:

- The noise assessment demonstrates that, through good design, that a large area of the proposed site would be suitable for residential end-use. A number of design measures are required to be considered which include:

- oExternal amenity areas should be screened from the M62. Proposed buildings should, in the first instance, provide a barrier to external areas from the M62;

- oThere may be the potential that screening through close boarded fences or a bund would provide noticeable attenuation but this is only likely to be suitable further into the site or as a secondary noise control measure to supplement the attenuation provided by buildings;

- oGaps between houses along the outer part of the site should be minimised as far as practicable, particularly for the first tier of properties facing the motorway;

- oEnhanced glazing and ventilation will also be required for habitable rooms orientated towards the motorway as well as potential for other area within the site. It is expected, however, that standard glazing will be acceptable in large parts of the site and openable windows as the principal form of ventilation in some areas;

- oNo gardens to align the eastern boundary with the adjacent industrial commercial units.

Whilst no noise generating activities were observed during either site visit, this is proposed as a precautionary approach due to the presence of service yards adjacent to the proposed development site boundary. Noise from industrial type units often have more onerous restrictions criteria than road traffic noise and it is our understanding that these units have unrestricted use in planning terms. Additionally as noted within Section 1, the NPPF references that existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established. Including this measure within the design will reduce the risk of potential future conflict.

It should be noted that the indicative site layout (Plan Ref 3207(1)010D) shows a robust landscape buffer adjacent to the M62. It also shows the access road through the site on the southern boundary of the site and driveways in front of properties providing a greater separation between the M62 and the homes. The indicative layout also refers to the provision of acoustic barriers in some locations. These measures, together with enhanced glazing will seek to minimise the impact of noise from the M62. It is therefore considered that issues relating to noise will not prevent the site from coming forward for housing.

Medical Centre - As referred to earlier, if this site is released for housing, Oakapple, through their specialist development company Oakapple Primary Care, will provide for a new medical centre for the nearby Church Farm Close Medical Practice. The new purpose designed medical centre will replace the existing surgery which is outdated, and as patient numbers rise, the level of accommodation is proving inadequate. The new medical centre will be provided for the local community at no cost to the practice. The previous owner of the land had offered this, and as mentioned earlier, his legacy is being honoured. The new medical centre is located close to the new access point at Church Farm Close so that patients wishing to visit the practice are not too far from the original surgery. The new centre also provides for staff and patient parking (including parking for bicycles).

Utilities and Environmental Issues

Oakapple Homes has undertaken a full Environmental and utilities review of the site including information from:Yorkshire Water; Northern Gas;

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1261

Housing

Church Farm and surrounding land north of M62, Lofthouse WF3 3SA

Name: Oakapple Homes

Representor No: PRS06500

Northern Power; RWE NPower; Coal Authority; BT; Leeds City Council Highways; and Environmental (contaminants). The findings of the searches undertaken would suggest that there are no constraints from bringing the land forward for housing. There are no contamination issues, and all utility services are readily available. A high pressure gas main crosses the site and will be left in situ.

Housing Land Supply - Lofthouse is classified as a 'smaller settlement' within the settlement hierarchy in the Draft Core Strategy and the key diagram shows that within the Lofthouse area, the Council anticipates that housing will grow by 500 – 1,000 houses over the Plan period.

The Council has a residual housing target of 2,407 units to deliver for the Outer South area. Whilst the new housing requirements are targets, it should be acknowledged that when adding up all the sites identified through the Draft Site Allocations DPD as "green sites" (i.e. those sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing), according to the site capacity identified for each of the green sites, these can only deliver 1,211 units over the Plan Period. This represents just 50.3% of the homes that the Council has identified as a target for the Outer South area. Turning to the amber sites, these can provide 2,042 units (or 84.8%) of the residual units required in the Outer South. Of the amber sites, 76.5% are within the Green Belt. This demonstrates that the Council will have to release Green Belt land if it is to meet the housing targets set out in the Draft Core Strategy for the Outer South area.

In recognition that the Council will have to consider the amber sites in more detail in order to meet the housing targets outlined in the Draft Site Allocations DPD, we have reviewed site 1261 within the context of the other amber sites and consider that it is the least constrained. The only reason for coding the site as amber is due to an assumption that access into the site is reliant on third party land. However as demonstrated, this is not the case. Therefore the land can deliver housing and should be considered favourably. The site can make a positive contribution to meeting housing targets as the 210 homes the site can deliver represents a delivery of 8.7% of the housing required in the Outer South area.

Those other sites identified as amber are more constrained, and in some instances have a number of constraints that may prevent them from coming forward for development. Constraints include being in Flood Zones 2 and 3, contribution land makes to the Green Belt, the size of sites when considered within the context of the settlement, sites being reliant on other sites to enable them to come forward for development, concerns regarding giving rise to urban sprawl and highways concerns.

Deliverability - Site 1261 is deliverable as the site is available immediately for development. The site is suitable for development as its removal would not have an impact on the Green Belt; it is located immediately adjacent to an existing settlement and is therefore well located in terms of access to services and facilities; the site is accessible by a wide range of sustainable transport modes; the highways assessment confirms that access is achievable in two locations and not reliant on third party land; it would "round off" the Lofthouse settlement; it is within flood zone 1 and the noise report submitted with this representation confirms that with effective layout and design the site will not be impacted upon by noise. The development of the site for housing is achievable and will also provide a new medical centre at no cost, which will benefit the local community.

Community Engagement - The release of site 1261 will provide additional family homes in a popular settlement within Leeds. It also provides specialist accommodation in the form of a Continuing Care Retirement Community which will allow those wishing to continue to live in Lofthouse when they are perhaps unable to live unassisted, to remain in the town. The inclusion of a purpose built medical centre will be of great benefit to the local community as medical care will now be provided in a purpose built, modern building. This will be at no cost to the local community or the practice. Whilst an indicative site layout has been prepared, this only represents one way in which the site can be delivered and Oakapple Homes look forward to working with the local community to discuss their views in the evolution of the scheme. Similarly, Oakapple Homes will be liaising with local ward members to review the site and the positive contribution its development can make to the local community and indeed the housing targets for the Outer South.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1261

Housing

Church Farm and surrounding land north of M62, Lofthouse WF3 3SA

Name: Oakapple Homes

Representor No: PRS06500

Representation ID: REP07633 Question Ref: H4

1261

Should be colour coded green. Oakapple Homes is part of the Oakapple Group; a Leeds based developer with particular expertise in residential and community based development, including Medical/Healthcare. WYG made a submission to Leeds City Council in August 2012 on behalf of Oakapple, setting out why it is considered that land at site 1261 does not contribute to the reasons for inclusion of land within the Green Belt. [The representation is supported by a series of site drawings, layout plan etc].

The site at Lofthouse is located off Church Farm Close. It is currently used as agricultural land. The developable area measures 6.3ha (15.5 acres). The area outlined in red, with the exception of a small part of the site to the North, is entirely within the Green Belt. The area not within the Green Belt is within the built up area and is classed as white land. Oakapple has an agreement with the land owners, including the proposed means of access to the site. It should be noted that the land which includes the warehouses to the north eastern boundary of the site is not required to unlock the land for development, and is not included within this representation.

The site immediately adjoins, and shares boundaries with, the built up area to the north and west. To the north east, the site also adjoins housing, but is separated by an abandoned railway, now overgrown with a band of trees. The M62 is to the south of the site. As outlined above, the area in red is predominantly within the designated Green Belt and outside of the development limit and is also designated as an Urban Fringe Priority Area. The site is within Flood Zone 1. There is an overhead power line which crosses the site, but which can be relocated to allow development under a Wayleave Agreement

WYG agrees with the Council observations regarding the Green Belt and the conclusion that releasing land from the Green Belt for housing would have minimal impact. For completeness we have included our summary table submitted to Leeds City Council last year.

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - The development of the site would not constitute ribbon development. Established residential streets restrict the site extending to the north, east and west. The M62 motorway is to the south. As such, the site is not remote from the built up area and it would form a sensible extension to the existing built up area. The site is well connected to the built up area, which is residential in character. The development of the site would fulfil the role "rounding off" this part of the Lofthouse settlement. Due to the location of the site within the context of this part of Lofthouse, the site would round off the settlement and would not give rise to the coalescence of settlements. In conclusion, and in accordance with the assessment criteria there is low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl.

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging - It is impossible to define a minimum distance that there should be between settlements. The important consideration is whether development would appear to result in the merger of built up areas. Topography and features such as rivers and major roads can act as barriers preventing merging. As set out above, the site is contained by existing buildings and infrastructure which would not allow the parcel of land extending in any direction. The redevelopment of the land would be contained to the boundaries shown on the plan above. There are other areas of Green Belt between Lofthouse and other settlements to prevent coalescence of settlements. The conclusion therefore is that development of the site would not result in merging of settlements.

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - There is no defensible boundaries between the site and the urban area. The parcel of land does not contribute to the role and function of the Green Belt and releasing it from the Green Belt designation would not compromise the purpose of Green Belt land. As set out in the above column, the site is surrounded on all sides by physical barriers which would prevent extending the site any further. As the site is surrounded by buildings and infrastructure, it does not provide any form of access to the open countryside. There are no public rights of way, footpaths or bridle ways that cross the land. There are no national or local nature conservation sites on, or within the vicinity of the site. The site does play host to 2 large areas of trees, one to the north east, acting as a barrier between the site and residents on Green Bank and the trees that separate the site from the M62 to the south. As these are established areas of planting they will be considered in the context of development in the future. The site is currently used for agricultural purposes. In accordance with DEFRA's MAGIC maps, the land is identified as Grade 3 land and therefore it is not land which provides high quality agricultural land. There are no buildings within the red line area. There is however an overhead power line which bisects the site. In conclusion the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns - This site is not within, or adjacent to a conservation area. There are no listed buildings or heritage assets on site, or within close proximity that would need to be taken into consideration. In conclusion development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features.

5. Assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land - Not considered here.

It is clear from the table above that the site does not perform any Green Belt function. Furthermore, this site adjoins the built up area and is therefore well connected to the Lofthouse settlement and access to local services, facilities and public transport is excellent. The Council acknowledge in the Draft Site Allocations DPD that the release of the land would have minimal impact on the Green Belt.

We do however refute the Council's conclusion that there is no suitable access at present. A transport statement has been undertaken by HY Consulting based on suitable means of access, and where Agreements exist between Oakapple and the landowners. A copy of this report can be made available on request, however for ease of reference we have summarised the highways findings below.

Highways - The transport statement prepared by HY Consulting confirms that access to the site will be achieved via two separate points; one at Green Bank to the north of the site, the other at Church Farm Close to the west of the site (these are detailed on Plan 3207(1)003). The northern site access will extend the present length of Green Bank which will bend south and pass between 19 and 22 Green Bank and into the site crossing the abandoned railway. This spine road will pass around a central green space before continuing west to join Church Farm close, which will be extended. A series of loop roads off this spine road will provide access to dwellings and other uses on site.

We are therefore able to conclude that based on the assessment of the Green Belt criteria, it is appropriate to remove the land out of the Green Belt to deliver housing and community benefits. The release of the site would effectively "round off" the settlement. Furthermore, the Council assumption that the land relies on the delivery of third party land to achieve access is incorrect.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1261

Housing

Church Farm and surrounding land north of M62, Lofthouse WF3 3SA

Name: Oakapple Homes

Representor No: PRS06500

In response to question H6 there should be no reason why the land at 1261 cannot be reclassified as a "green" site and be allocated for housing, as access can be achieved without third party land.

In order to consider the contribution that the site can make to the housing land supply, an indicative site layout plan has been prepared to consider how the land could come forward for development and this is attached for the Council's information (Plan Ref 3207(1)010D). There have been a number of technical issues to take into consideration and reports have been prepared. We have not included these reports with this submission; however they can be made available on request. For ease we have summarised these below.

Quantum of Development - The indicative site layout shows that the site can be developed to provide 210 dwellings, which comprises 189 houses (2, 3 and 4 bedroom) and 21 apartments (1 bedroom). The mix of house types is considered acceptable for this location which is popular with family type accommodation. The site also allows for a 60 unit Continuing Care Retirement Community, identified as an essential local need to meet the demands of the growing number of older people living in Lofthouse. The layout also provides accommodation for a new medical centre for the Church Farm Close Medical Practice. This has been included as the original land owner, who has now passed away, wished to provide the local community with a new doctor's surgery. As the land is still within the ownership of the family, they intend to respect his wishes and fulfil the promise made. Church Farm Close Medical Practice will be submitting a letter in support of the allocation of this site for housing and their new surgery. The site has been laid out to reflect the local vernacular; this in turn has helped inform the density of development which is commensurate with those residential streets which surround the site.

Transport - As set out above, access can be achieved via Green Bank and Church Farm Close. The transport statement prepared to support this site promotion provides details of highways impact. It is concluded "there are no particular road safety or capacity issues that could reasonably be raised as a result of this increase in traffic when compared to nationally accepted guidance". The transport statement also considers sustainable transport. There are several bus stops within 400m of the site; Green Lane, Ouzlewell Green and on the A61 (south of the junction with Church Farm Close). The stops at Green Lane and Ouzlewell Green provide access to service 153 which provides a route to Morley, Rothwell and Castleford and the 444 which runs between Leeds, Wakefield and Hall Green. The stop on the A61 provides access to the 110 service which is a route between Leeds and Wakefield. The bus services outlined above also provide direct access to both Leeds and Wakefield Train Stations. Looking at provision for pedestrians, footways are provided on either side of the principle roads surrounding the site. Both Green Lane and Ouzlewell Green are designated as advisory cycle routes on the Leeds Cycle Map.

Sustainability - The site is well connected to the existing built up area of Lofthouse. There is a plan submitted with this representation to show the site within the context of the surrounding area and existing facilities and services (Plan Ref 3207(1)006). [A table in representation provides further detail.]

Noise - The southern boundary of the site is adjacent to the M62. In recognition of the site's proximity to this principle road, it is acknowledged that it is necessary to consider the impact that noise may have on the developable area of the site. As such, a noise assessment has been prepared by WYG and concludes:

- The noise assessment demonstrates that, through good design, that a large area of the proposed site would be suitable for residential end-use. A number of design measures are required to be considered which include:

- oExternal amenity areas should be screened from the M62. Proposed buildings should, in the first instance, provide a barrier to external areas from the M62;

- oThere may be the potential that screening through close boarded fences or a bund would provide noticeable attenuation but this is only likely to be suitable further into the site or as a secondary noise control measure to supplement the attenuation provided by buildings;

- oGaps between houses along the outer part of the site should be minimised as far as practicable, particularly for the first tier of properties facing the motorway;

- oEnhanced glazing and ventilation will also be required for habitable rooms orientated towards the motorway as well as potential for other area within the site. It is expected, however, that standard glazing will be acceptable in large parts of the site and openable windows as the principal form of ventilation in some areas;

- oNo gardens to align the eastern boundary with the adjacent industrial commercial units.

Whilst no noise generating activities were observed during either site visit, this is proposed as a precautionary approach due to the presence of service yards adjacent to the proposed development site boundary. Noise from industrial type units often have more onerous restrictions criteria than road traffic noise and it is our understanding that these units have unrestricted use in planning terms. Additionally as noted within Section 1, the NPPF references that existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established. Including this measure within the design will reduce the risk of potential future conflict.

It should be noted that the indicative site layout (Plan Ref 3207(1)010D) shows a robust landscape buffer adjacent to the M62. It also shows the access road through the site on the southern boundary of the site and driveways in front of properties providing a greater separation between the M62 and the homes. The indicative layout also refers to the provision of acoustic barriers in some locations. These measures, together with enhanced glazing will seek to minimise the impact of noise from the M62. It is therefore considered that issues relating to noise will not prevent the site from coming forward for housing.

Medical Centre - As referred to earlier, if this site is released for housing, Oakapple, through their specialist development company Oakapple Primary Care, will provide for a new medical centre for the nearby Church Farm Close Medical Practice. The new purpose designed medical centre will replace the existing surgery which is outdated, and as patient numbers rise, the level of accommodation is proving inadequate. The new medical centre will be provided for the local community at no cost to the practice. The previous owner of the land had offered this, and as mentioned earlier, his legacy is being honoured. The new medical centre is located close to the new access point at Church Farm Close so that patients wishing to visit the practice are not too far from the original surgery. The new centre also provides for staff and patient parking (including parking for bicycles).

Utilities and Environmental Issues

Oakapple Homes has undertaken a full Environmental and utilities review of the site including information from:Yorkshire Water; Northern Gas;

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1261

Housing

Church Farm and surrounding land north of M62, Lofthouse WF3 3SA

Name: Oakapple Homes

Representor No: PRS06500

Northern Power; RWE NPower; Coal Authority; BT; Leeds City Council Highways; and Environmental (contaminants). The findings of the searches undertaken would suggest that there are no constraints from bringing the land forward for housing. There are no contamination issues, and all utility services are readily available. A high pressure gas main crosses the site and will be left in situ.

Housing Land Supply - Lofthouse is classified as a 'smaller settlement' within the settlement hierarchy in the Draft Core Strategy and the key diagram shows that within the Lofthouse area, the Council anticipates that housing will grow by 500 – 1,000 houses over the Plan period.

The Council has a residual housing target of 2,407 units to deliver for the Outer South area. Whilst the new housing requirements are targets, it should be acknowledged that when adding up all the sites identified through the Draft Site Allocations DPD as "green sites" (i.e. those sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing), according to the site capacity identified for each of the green sites, these can only deliver 1,211 units over the Plan Period. This represents just 50.3% of the homes that the Council has identified as a target for the Outer South area. Turning to the amber sites, these can provide 2,042 units (or 84.8%) of the residual units required in the Outer South. Of the amber sites, 76.5% are within the Green Belt. This demonstrates that the Council will have to release Green Belt land if it is to meet the housing targets set out in the Draft Core Strategy for the Outer South area.

In recognition that the Council will have to consider the amber sites in more detail in order to meet the housing targets outlined in the Draft Site Allocations DPD, we have reviewed site 1261 within the context of the other amber sites and consider that it is the least constrained. The only reason for coding the site as amber is due to an assumption that access into the site is reliant on third party land. However as demonstrated, this is not the case. Therefore the land can deliver housing and should be considered favourably. The site can make a positive contribution to meeting housing targets as the 210 homes the site can deliver represents a delivery of 8.7% of the housing required in the Outer South area.

Those other sites identified as amber are more constrained, and in some instances have a number of constraints that may prevent them from coming forward for development. Constraints include being in Flood Zones 2 and 3, contribution land makes to the Green Belt, the size of sites when considered within the context of the settlement, sites being reliant on other sites to enable them to come forward for development, concerns regarding giving rise to urban sprawl and highways concerns.

Deliverability - Site 1261 is deliverable as the site is available immediately for development. The site is suitable for development as its removal would not have an impact on the Green Belt; it is located immediately adjacent to an existing settlement and is therefore well located in terms of access to services and facilities; the site is accessible by a wide range of sustainable transport modes; the highways assessment confirms that access

is achievable in two locations and not reliant on third party land; it would "round off" the Lofthouse settlement; it is within flood zone 1 and the noise report submitted with this representation confirms that with effective layout and design the site will not be impacted upon by noise. The development of the site for housing is achievable and will also provide a new medical centre at no cost, which will benefit the local community.

Community Engagement - The release of site 1261 will provide additional family homes in a popular settlement within Leeds. It also provides specialist accommodation in the form of a Continuing Care Retirement Community which will allow those wishing to continue to live in Lofthouse when they are perhaps unable to live unassisted, to remain in the town. The inclusion of a purpose built medical centre will be of great benefit to the local community as medical care will now be provided in a purpose built, modern building. This will be at no cost to the local community or the practice. Whilst an indicative site layout has been prepared, this only represents one way in which the site can be delivered and Oakapple Homes look forward to working with the local community to discuss their views in the evolution of the scheme. Similarly, Oakapple Homes will be liaising with local ward members to review the site and the positive contribution its development can make to the local community and indeed the housing targets for the Outer South.

Representation ID: REP07633 Question Ref: H11

Whilst we recognise that the Council's preferred approach is for Green Belt sites to be released after the first phase of the plan period (Draft Core Strategy H1), we consider that site 1261 can come forward within the first phase of housing in the Plan period; i.e. 0 – 5 years. This site represents the least constrained of the amber sites, the Council is comfortable that the land can be released from the Green Belt with minimal impact, the site has strong links to the existing community and the development will also provide a new medical centre to serve the local community which is required in the short term. The release of the land in phase 1 will help deliver this much needed local service.

Name: R Knowles

Representor No: PRS06663

Representation ID: REP07887 Question Ref: H4

Site 1261 — See submitted representation for full details

This site has significant highway concerns. No suitable access is proposed nor is one considered deliverable. Furthermore, the development of this site would be difficult due to the noise issues therefore should only deliver 100 of the 279 dwellings identified.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1261

Housing

Church Farm and surrounding land north of M62, Lofthouse WF3 3SA

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1335

Housing

Mill Pit Lane, Rothwell LS26

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H7

1335 -

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1355

Housing

Wood Lane (r/o 26-32), Rothwell

Name: Richard Hollinson

Representor No: PRS03384

Representation ID: REP02077 Question Ref: G8

No comment.

Name: James O'Neill

Representor No: PRS04042

Representation ID: REP00898 Question Ref: G8

There are other areas in Leeds where the council spent millions of pounds on upgrading houses (Holbeck, Garnets) so they did not lose the funding from London, only then to knock them down, a complete utter waste of money. Re-generate these areas, to create work for the local people.

Name: Christopher Rolph

Representor No: PRS04051

Representation ID: REP01801 Question Ref: G8

Highway visibility issues. Should remain as greenspace.

Name: Roger Downing

Representor No: PRS04229

Representation ID: REP01799 Question Ref: G8

none

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H7

1355 - Agree Red - see full submitted representation for details.

Although scoring highly in some areas, this site is designated as a UDP N5 (Open Space) and is also identified as Natural Greenspace in the Open Space Audit. The site is a local nature area and is part of the larger "Pastures" designated Natural Greenspace area which contains an ancient monument. Taking these factors into account, along with its highway visibility and access issues, this site should therefore remain as Natural Greenspace and we concur with the Red category

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 - Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1359

Housing

Wood Lane - Rothwell Garden Centre LS26

Name: Kirby Louise Duncan

Representor No: PRS03045

Representation ID: REP00664 Question Ref: H1

I am extremely unhappy about the proposed plans in the area. I bought the house I am living in now on Friday last week. However I was totally unaware of your proposals before releasing funds and completing the purchase. I will be consulting my solicitor about the local search that was carried out by yourselves re this. I found out through a neighbour about your proposals as I do not believe you have publicised this to local residents. The area is already highly populated. There is already a lot of traffic in the area. Schools are already over populated with large class sizes. Are you going to build a new school too. Are you going to sort the already shoddy roads to cope with extra traffic. You struggle now to get in the doctors what are you going to do about this. My house currently backs on to a field. A field which I think is great. A field that holds lots of natural wildlife and a right of way to walk in to view the wildlife. How can you take this away when there is hardly any around the area I have bought this house. And how much in value will my house depreciate - because it will. I would have bought elsewhere if I had known. Why didn't this proposed buildings be highlighted in a search? A search that was carried out very very recently. I need to know exactly what action you are going to take on the surrounding land. I am very unhappy and angry and I feel my first ever dream home (as I am a first time buyer) is not the dream home I was led to believe. I would like a full explanation please. [x]

Representation ID: REP00664 Question Ref: H2

1049 and 1058 see above comments -all comments 1359 - see above comments re traffic, schools, doctors , roads, wildlife issues.

Name: Denman House Holdings Ltd

Representor No: PRS05001

Representation ID: REP01962 Question Ref: H1

Site 1359 has been selected as a site for residential development. Our clients, Denman House holdings Ltd support this allocation. The site will effectively round off this part of Rothwell and more importantly, the site does not contain any attributes to warrant its inclusion in the Green Belt. The site is located in a very accessible position in Rothwell and when developed, will be compatible with its surrounding land uses. The site is in close proximity to a number of services and facilities in Rothwell and is considered to be sustainable in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework. Our clients are currently working on providing further details to ensure the deliverability of the site.

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H1

1359 - Agree Green - see full submitted representation for details.

Although Green Belt land, this site is considered reasonably acceptable for potential housing allocation and could be either a stand alone site, or linked with the adjoining brownfield Garden Centre site (East Leeds HMCA). (However, if the garden centre itself was to be closed, this would be a very significant loss of amenity to Rothwell, being the only major garden centre located in and serving Rothwell and its surrounding districts. Closure would also have some adverse impact on employment.)

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1359

Housing

Wood Lane - Rothwell Garden Centre LS26

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1365A

Housing

Swithens Lane, Rothwell, Leeds LS26 0BS

Name: Colin Dawson

Representor No: PRS03138

Representation ID: REP01515 Question Ref: H3

1365A, 1365B, 1049, 1058 because they are already adjacent to large built areas with sufficient amenities and infrastructure, or can be provided with such as part of the development.

Name: Charles Offord

Representor No: PRS04171

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H3

1365a + 1365b these site attach to existing development. They have no highways issues, and greater access to the infrastructure and amenities of Rothwell. The landowner is willing to offer the site up as a substitute to 3084 and the sites combined offer 252 houses which would go a considerable way to supporting the Leeds south outer target

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H4

1365a + 1365b these site attach to existing development. They have no highways issues, and greater access to the infrastructure and amenities of Rothwell. The landowner is willing to offer the site up as a substitute to 3084 and the sites combined offer 252 houses which would go a considerable way to supporting the Leeds south outer target

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H6

site 1365b would be a progression from 1365a and would support the Rothwell town centre without causing major disruption. It does not block in any aspect or cause to join up with the Carlton settlement

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H11

1365a move to short term 1365b move to medium term new site next to site 1249 on A642 short

Name: Lorraine Offord

Representor No: PRS04301

Representation ID: REP01991 Question Ref: H3

1365A should be green as it rounds off a settlement

Representation ID: REP01991 Question Ref: H4

1365A should be green as it rounds off a settlement

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H4

1365A

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1365A

Housing

Swithens Lane, Rothwell, Leeds LS26 0BS

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1365B

Housing

Swithens Lane, Rothwell, Leeds LS26 0BS

Name: Colin Dawson

Representor No: PRS03138

Representation ID: REP01515 Question Ref: H3

1365A, 1365B, 1049, 1058 because they are already adjacent to large built areas with sufficient amenities and infrastructure, or can be provided with such as part of the development.

Name: Charles Offord

Representor No: PRS04171

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H3

1365a + 1365b these site attach to existing development. They have no highways issues, and greater access to the infrastructure and amenities of Rothwell. The landowner is willing to offer the site up as a substitute to 3084 and the sites combined offer 252 houses which would go a considerable way to supporting the Leeds south outer target

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H4

1365a + 1365b these site attach to existing development. They have no highways issues, and greater access to the infrastructure and amenities of Rothwell. The landowner is willing to offer the site up as a substitute to 3084 and the sites combined offer 252 houses which would go a considerable way to supporting the Leeds south outer target

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H6

site 1365b would be a progression from 1365a and would support the Rothwell town centre without causing major disruption. It does not block in any aspect or cause to joining up with the Carlton settlement

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H7

1365b has support of local owner, provides good access. built up on two areas. rounds of settlement.

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H8

1365b has support of local owner, provides good access. built up on two areas. rounds of settlement

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H11

1365a move to short term 1365b move to medium term new site next to site 1249 on A642 short

Name: Lorraine Offord

Representor No: PRS04301

Representation ID: REP01991 Question Ref: H6

1365b rounds off a settlement

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H7

1365B Agree Red - see full submitted representation for details.

We agree this greenfield site is not acceptable for development, being isolated from the main settlement hierarchy and any potential housing allocation could lead to urban sprawl into the Greenbelt. The site also has a highly visible skyline and its rising ground is quite prominent from various viewpoints. There would also be additional problems of road access as already referred to under site 1365A, which would be yet further exacerbated and we completely agree with the Red category.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1365B

Housing

Swithens Lane, Rothwell, Leeds LS26 0BS

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2103

Housing

Copley Lane Allotments, Robin Hood WF3

Name: Walter Morley

Representor No: PRS02877

Representation ID: REP05438 Question Ref: G9

G9/1175A

This site has been earmarked for development although, we are told that part of it is contaminated Land. It is also in the green belt. 76 dwellings would realise possibly 100 plus vehicles which would all exit onto Brigshaw lane. This is a well used road for pupils of Brigshaw academy and therefore this development could cause an accident zone

Name: Richard Hollinson

Representor No: PRS03384

Representation ID: REP02077 Question Ref: G9

No comment.

Name: James O'Neill

Representor No: PRS04042

Representation ID: REP00898 Question Ref: G9

Another area that should be left untouched.

Name: Roger Downing

Representor No: PRS04229

Representation ID: REP01799 Question Ref: G9

none

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H7

2103 Allotments Copley Lane – I support the designation of this site as Red. In response to question G9 this site and the neighbouring site need to be retained as an important local amenity greenspace – they are currently used for allotments, a community orchard and community garden.

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H7

2103 Agree Red - see full submitted representation for details.

This site is considered unacceptable for development and indeed is designated as a UDP Ni (Allotments) and also identified as Allotments in the Open Space Audit. The site is very well looked after and obviously very productive. We consider it is extremely important that this site remains as allotments and agree with the "Red" designation

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07894 Question Ref: G9

Access to open spaces and opportunities for recreation and the enjoyment of wildlife make an important contribution to the health and well being of communities. This is the thrust of national policy and is reflected in the draft Core Strategy. There is only a very small surplus of allotment space in the Outer South MCA. Site 2103 would involve the loss of the northern section of Copley Lane allotments thereby having a detrimental effect on the overall quality of this provision.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2103

Housing

Copley Lane Allotments, Robin Hood WF3

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: M Aillsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: J & J Prescott

Representor No: PRS04996

Representation ID: REP02008 Question Ref: H7

3320 better identified as amber. Relates well to settlement pattern and not as drawn an isolated allocation for which see plan to be annexed. Site 2104, Westfield considered also as an appropriate candidate if additional numbers are required.

Representation ID: REP02008 Question Ref: H11

medium long term

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H7

1030 Pymont Farm - I agree that this should be red for the reasons set out in the consultation document – GreenBelt, access and that it does not relate well to the existing development. If development were allowed on this site it would also make it more difficult to protect the rest of the Green Belt around this site. Residents have suggested that this site might make a useful extension to the cemetery.

1050 Land off Westfield Road – I agree that this site should be red for the reasons set out in the consultation document. Green Belt, scale doesn't relate well to existing settlement and would result in significant urban sprawl.

2103 Allotments Copley Lane – I support the designation of this site as Red. In response to question G9 this site and the neighbouring site need to be retained as an important local amenity greenspace – they are currently used for allotments, a community orchard and community garden.

2104 Leeds Road Lofthouse – I support the designation of this site as Red for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

3084 Cemetery Lane, Lofthouse – I support the designation of this site as Red for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

3445B Leadwell Lane, Robin Hood – I support the designation of this site as Red. Again this is a Green Belt site and one that is not connected to the existing residential area. The site is significant in size and scale and would have a harmful impact on the Green Belt function of separating settlements – in this case Robin Hood and its neighbouring town of Rothwell.

173 The Peg Football Ground, East Ardsley – I support this designation as Red for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

314 Boyle Hall, West Ardsley – I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

1067A off Woodhouse Lane – I wholeheartedly support the Red designation of this site. Development here would lead to unrestricted urban sprawl into the Green Belt as well as being unsustainable in school, GP surgery and public transport terms.

1068 Stoney Lane, East Ardsley – I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

1143A Land off Old Thorpe Lane, Tingley – This site is not suitable for development and should stay Red. It is Green Belt, would be contingent on development on the neighbouring site, therefore resulting in an unsustainable level of new housing in this one location and would result in urban sprawl. Concerns have also been raised by a resident about the air pollution levels which are significant in this vicinity near to the motorway and Tingley roundabout. Pollution levels should be thoroughly checked out in this area and around junction 41 before any further housing is built in either of these two locations.

1143C Spinkwell Lane Playing Fields, Tingley – this site should be protected as playing fields. It is not suitable for housing!

1143E Tingley Athletic Ground, East Ardsley – as per comments for 1143C this site should be protected for playing fields. It is not suitable for housing!

1260 N and S of Batley Road, West Ardsley – a completely unacceptable and unsustainable scale of development. The site is Green Belt. This would lead to erosion of the separation between districts and intolerable pressure on the very limited local amenities.

2096 West Wood Road, Middleton, 2099 Dunningley Hill Farm and 2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse – I support the Red designation of these sites for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

3075 Scrapyard, Thorpe Lane, Middleton – Whilst supposed to be Green Belt this site is currently in use as a scrap yard. Enforcement action is being sought by a Middleton Councillor. The site as it stands extends too far to the South and is not well enough connected to existing settlements. Access onto Thorpe Lane would also need to be well thought out given the bend in the road here.

3320 Thorpe Villa and Middleton Lane, Thorpe – I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document and because of the need to retain the separation between settlements.

3372 East of Baghill Road - I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

3373B Haigh Wood, West Ardsley - I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document. This wood is well used and much loved by the local community and walkers and cyclists from further afield and must be protected.

3456B Ardsley Reservoir - I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document and because it would lead to the erosion of the separation between the villages of East and West Ardsley.

Name: Carlton Neighbourhood Association

Representor No: PRS06375

Representation ID: REP07379 Question Ref: H7

2104 - Agree should be red - see submitted representation for full details.

This site is Green Belt land and its development would represent significant sprawl in relation to the size of the settlement. It also does not connect well to existing dwellings and hosts a Local Nature Area in the northern section.

Development of the site would mean the loss of the railway embankment that is used for recreation and pastimes, and is home to an abundance of wildlife (including the occasional deer).

The size of the development upon this site is also disproportionate in relation to the existing settlement.

The CVRA considers this site inappropriate for development.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: Justin Coley

Representor No: PRS06448

Representation ID: REP07524 Question Ref: H7

SITE 2104 Leeds Road Lofthouse

This site is Green Belt land and its development would represent significant sprawl in relation to the size of the settlement. It also does not connect well to existing dwellings and hosts a Local Nature Area in the northern section.

Development of the site would mean the loss of the railway embankment that is used for recreation and pastimes, and is home to an abundance of wildlife (including the occasional deer).

The size of the development upon this site is also disproportionate in relation to the existing settlement.

The CVRA considers this site inappropriate for development

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2107A

Housing

Fleet Lane, Woodlesford, LS26

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: H7

"Fleet Lane" Woodlesford. Green Belt blighted by H2 rail.

Name: Martyn Coy

Representor No: PRS04068

Representation ID: REP01177 Question Ref: H7

We agree that Sites 2107a and 2107b are unsuitable for housing for the reasons specified within the consultation document; in particular, the sites would represent urban sprawl within the Green Belt and fail to accord with paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2107B

Housing

Fleet Lane, Woodlesford, LS26

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: H7

"Fleet Lane" Woodlesford. Green Belt blighted by H2 rail.

Name: Martyn Coy

Representor No: PRS04068

Representation ID: REP01177 Question Ref: H7

We agree that Sites 2107a and 2107b are unsuitable for housing for the reasons specified within the consultation document; in particular, the sites would represent urban sprawl within the Green Belt and fail to accord with paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Name: D.j Cove

Representor No: PRS05192

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: H7

2107B Agree with Red

We agree with Site Allocations Plan that this site should not be allocated for housing.

Access is poor and there is a flood risk. We agree with "red" classification.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2110

Housing

Rothwell Sports Centre, Oulton LS26

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: General comment

Methley Lane Sieved out/Support

Name: D.j Cove

Representor No: PRS05192

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: General comment

2110 Agree with Purple

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: General comment

3012 Agree with Purple

We agree with Site Allocations Plan that this site should be sieved out, given that it does not accord with the Leeds Core Strategy, in particular the settlement hierachy which guides where housing growth should be located in the district.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2129

Housing

Mickletown Road Methley

Name: David Blackburn

Representor No: PRS02281

Representation ID: REP07250 Question Ref: H1

2129 This is PAS land which in our view should not be developed while any brownfield land is available.

Name: Richard Hackett

Representor No: PRS03104

Representation ID: REP01943 Question Ref: H1

There are insufficient primary school places within the village to cope with an additional 200 plus homes. The medical centre within the village would be unable to cope with that additional volume of patients. The road junction between Church Road and the A639 is dangerous enough without adding an additional 400 cars using that junction from an additional 200 homes. What plans do the council have to, if these plans are approved, address these concerns so local services do not become overwhelmed? In addition, this is a 'flood risk' area. The housing proposal is sited in a site which is vulnerable to flooding and, if developed, may cause more problems to other properties in the area due to the current field becoming impermeable due to buildings, roads & pavements.

Representation ID: REP01943 Question Ref: H5

Map 30 Station Road, Methley. See fuller answer provided to previous question. Concerns include primary place sufficiency (or lack of), concern over road junctions unable to cope with increased traffic volumes and flooding risks posed by building on vulnerable land next to the River Aire.

Representation ID: REP01943 Question Ref: H8

Map 30, Station Road, Methley. Reasons already stated in previous answers.

Representation ID: REP01943 Question Ref: H2

Map 30, green section (Station Road) See response above. Concern over lack of school place sufficiency. Concern over road safety at key junction. Additional concern relating to flooding liability creating additional risk to existing properties in the area.

Name: Justin Hancock

Representor No: PRS03990

Representation ID: REP01297 Question Ref: H1

Banks Property Ltd is promoting the imminent release of land at Station Road, Mickletown (site 2129). In the context of the Outer South this site is appropriately identified as green - the only such site in the Mickletown/Methley area. The site is not in the green belt and is immediately developable. We do not believe that approval of this site needs to be postponed until the Allocations Plan is finalised. The PAS sites were designated PAS for a reason as they should be made available for development in the short term so that Leeds can make the best long term plans affecting the Green Belt.

Representation ID: REP01297 Question Ref: H11

Site 2129 should be developed in the short term. Banks Property Ltd is preparing a planning application which would deliver a sustainable development in an area where people want to live. The development would be able to support improvements to the local area as well as meeting urgent needs.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2129

Housing

Mickletown Road Methley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999

Representation ID: REP07421 Question Ref: H1

This site includes Shann Cottage which 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 these assets and what effect its loss and subsequent development might have upon their significance. If allocated, any development proposals for this area would elements which contribute to the significance of these assets are not harmed.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3012

Housing

Iveridge Hall, Oulton

Name: D.j Cove

Representor No: PRS05192

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: General comment

3012 Agree with Purple

We agree with Site Allocations Plan that this site should be sieved out, given that it does not accord with the Leeds Core Strategy, in particular the settlement hierachy which guides where housing growth should be located in the district.

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: General comment

3012

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3080

Housing

Wood Lane, Rothwell

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H7

3080 - Agree Red - see full submitted representation for details.

Whilst having some merits, this site is isolated from the main settlement hierarchy and any potential housing allocation, especially in conjunction with the adjoining site 3079 (East Leeds HMCA), could lead to urban sprawl into the Greenbelt up to the motorway. Therefore it is agreed that this site should remain Red category and undeveloped.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Margaret Wainwright

Representor No: PRS01137

Representation ID: REP03211 Question Ref: H1

The area does not need more housing, The schools are already overcrowded. The trunk road is too busy. This should not be allowed to go ahead we need green space.

Name: Michael And Carol Burns

Representor No: PRS01141

Representation ID: REP03215 Question Ref: H1

Utter disgust at this proposal. The land was for sale as agriculture only. Some back hand tactics have been in action. At no stage have we been consulted. We don't want to look out at a housing estate. The Council are rubbish!

Name: John And Marie Lawson

Representor No: PRS01148

Representation ID: REP03223 Question Ref: H1

3081A - Why weren't we informed about this and asked what we feel about it. It has taken a local resident to come across this information and inform all Robin Hood about this, it is a disgrace that we were not informed by you or had a choice to our opinion.

We have lived here since 1991, we do not want houses built behind us. It will lower the value of our homes and our privacy, which we have in our gardens, will go, also the lovely views we have.

The consultation says 3rd June til 29th July, why didn't we get to know til 25th July? We do not want our view killed with 373 or even 1 house built behind our homes.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Daniel Pritchard

Representor No: PRS01921

Representation ID: REP04100 Question Ref: H1

3081A -

I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the planned sites 3081A and 3081B in addition to all of the land around this area getting removed from the Greenbelt.

1. The excessive size of this development will harm the character of the village, the number of new families would destroy what is already a pushed to the limit local community.

2. Existing facilities and infrastructure would not cope. I live on Middleton Avenue and already have frequent issues with my water pressure, there is no way that the existing infrastructure would be able to support a development of 100 houses let alone 373.

3. This land is green belt land, when I bought my house it had a certain value because it is close to green belt land, I find it totally abhorrent that you are removing the greenbelt from all of the land around me. Especially as this land was sold initially as for agricultural purposes only and this was advertised on all of the hoarding boards when the site was up for sale.

4. Brownfield sites which are available should be considered prior to dismantling all of the green belt.

The land has been a farm for over 100 years, I find it totally irresponsible that you think it is your place to destroy what has been built up for 100's of years for the sake of a housing estate that no one in the local area wants. This will also increase the distance food has to travel to get from farm to shelf, therefore increasing carbon emissions and negatively impacting the environment.

6. The land is of local and national significance, this is in the middle of the rhubarb triangle which is world famous.

7. Local Schools (Robin Hood, Carlton, Rodillian) are already stretched to capacity as are local medical facilities such as dentists and doctors. There is no capacity for an increase of any kind let alone the massive development that you're planning, it is already a struggle to even get a doctors or dentist appointment, let alone with an additional 800-1000 people in the area.

8. The A61 road is queuing all the time at rush hour as it is for miles back, there is simply not capacity on this road (or sharp lane) for the additional proposed houses.

9. This development is on agricultural/rural land and should not be allowed, this is not sustainable nor is it responsible development.

10. Extensive housing on this planned site would seriously erode the split between Middleton/Rothwell/Robin Hood, this is a key part and feature of the green belt.

In summary I do not want this development, no one in the local area wants this development and it is 100% suspect that this was not publicised in any way other than a short article which has to be searched for on your website.

I will fight this through all avenues available to me as will a large number of local residents.

Please see below for my full address details and email back to me with either an objection reference number or confirmation that you have received this objection.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Daniel Pritchard

Representor No: PRS01921

Representation ID: REP06471 Question Ref: H1

I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the planned sites 3081A and 3081B in addition to all of the land around this area getting removed from the Greenbelt.

1. The excessive size of this development will harm the character of the village, the number of new families would destroy what is already a pushed to the limit local community.
2. Existing facilities and infrastructure would not cope. I live on Middleton Avenue and already have frequent issues with my water pressure, there is no way that the existing infrastructure would be able to support a development of 100 houses let alone 373.
3. 3. This land is green belt land, when I bought my house it had a certain value because it is close to green belt land, I find it totally abhorrent that you are removing the greenbelt from all of the land around me. Especially as this land was sold initially as for agricultural purposes only and this was advertised on all of the hoarding boards when the site was up for sale.
4. 4. Brownfield sites which are available should be considered prior to dismantling all of the green belt.
5. 5. The land has been a farm for over 100 years, I find it totally irresponsible that you think it is your place to destroy what has been built up for 100's of years for the sake of a housing estate that no one in the local area wants. This will also increase the distance food has to travel to get from farm to shelf, therefore increasing carbon emissions and negatively impacting the environment.
6. 6. The land is of local and national significance, this is in the middle of the rhubarb triangle which is world famous.
7. 7. Local Schools (Robin Hood, Carlton, Rodillian) are already stretched to capacity as are local medical facilities such as dentists and doctors. There is no capacity for an increase of any kind let alone the massive development that you're planning, it is already a struggle to even get a doctors or dentist appointment, let alone with an additional 800-1000 people in the area.
8. 8. The A61 road is queuing all the time at rush hour as it is for miles back, there is simply not capacity on this road (or sharp lane) for the additional proposed houses.
9. 9. This development is on agricultural/rural land and should not be allowed, this is not sustainable nor is it responsible development.
10. 10. Extensive housing on this planned site would seriously erode the split between Middleton/Rothwell/Robin Hood, this is a key part and feature of the green belt.

In summary I do not want this development, no one in the local area wants this development and it is 100% suspect that this was not publicised in any way other than a short article which has to be searched for on your website. I will fight this through all avenues available to me as will a large number of local residents.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Katrina Mortimer

Representor No: PRS02020

Representation ID: REP07131 Question Ref: H1

Site 3081A, Hope Farm - Green to Red

I was annoyed to hear 3rd party that there were planning put in place for site reference 3081 A&B. This land was up for sale 3 months ago and was being sold as arable land. Not only is this land arable land it is also Green Belt land. The green Belt would now be reduced to 1 field width. I do not consider this to be sufficient . The council is gradually eroding the open spaces of this area until it is becoming part of the urban sprawl. Robin Hood, Rothwell, Carlton, Lofthouse etc still try to retain their village communities. The local schools are filled to capacity and so where are all these extra children going to go? Doctors and dentists will not be able to cope with the extra demand and that is only from this development though there are others planned in the vicinity. Properties in this area sell for a premium and by the time that you have done with your proposed development I have no doubt that prices will fall. I bought my house because it was rural and that will be disappearing.

FOR ONCE CONSIDER THE PEOPLE IN THE AREA AND FORGET THE £ SIGNS FROM COUNCIL TAX

There are other new developments in Robin Hood but they are not selling with any speed because nobody has the money to buy them. Why will this development prove to be any different?

We are closing power stations down and risk the threat of power cuts over the next few years and so how can you meet the demands of new developments.

Can the sewage plants cope? All these new houses are getting built but there is no extra sewage plants.

Junction of Sharp Lane, Copley Lane and Wakefield Road are a black spot and adding 373 vehicles to this will not make things any better. In fact you would be responsible for the amount of accidents that occur on this stretch of road.

Representation ID: REP04221 Question Ref: H1

3081A -

[Sent from Ed Balls MP's office]

I have been contacted in my constituency office by the above constituent in relation to local planning issues.

I have enclosed a copy of their correspondence for your information and action where appropriate.

Thank you very much for your assistance

I am writing for your help and support, On 25 July 2013 I was posted a letter explaining how the land surrounding my street and village has being put forward with developers. I have until the 29th July 2013 to oppose this. Nowhere has there being information of this. The land I am referring to is Site Reference 3081 A&B GRID 29 www.gov.uk/siteallocations . While looking at this grid I notices the surrounding area is being suffocated by planning applications on arable land and green belt land. All the history of these little villages and the character are being lost to thrown up houses with no character sold in a desirable location near our schools which the local children cannot even get into. I am annoyed and upset at the secrecy behind these plans I would be grateful if you could contact me on 07713358120 to see if there is anything you could do for us as a community. I would like to set up a meeting so local councillors and the local people could all come together and stop this from happening or just to see where we stand and what we can do to prevent it. I would be grateful if you could contact me asap as we do not have much time.

Name: Mr & Mrs Crowley

Representor No: PRS02698

Representation ID: REP05153 Question Ref: H1

I am writing to lodge our opposition to the proposed developments 3081 A / 3081 B

I resent the fact that once again green belt- agricultural land must be destroyed in favour of housing developments.

Announcing the proposals at the beginning of the summer holidays seems to have been a very cynical ploy to minimize the consultation/discussion in an attempt to force the proposals through with the minimum of fuss.

At the very least all local residents should have been notified and a meeting called to discuss the proposals.

Once this land is developed it will be gone for ever- have all the builds constructed during the last-ill fated 'housing boom' really be occupied? After all it was the housing boom that ultimately resulted in the banking crisis.

who will be able to afford these new houses in our current and on-going financial crisis?

Surely the money could be better spent on improving current housing stock and working on Brown Field sites?

The proposed number of houses could be classed as 'high density' where will these new residents

go to walk the dog/exercise-enjoy their local surroundings, where is the environmental impact assessment?

where will the shops and local amenities be. how will the road system cope-even more accidents at the war memorial?

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Philip Cunningham

Representor No: PRS02733

Representation ID: REP05259 Question Ref: H1

Objection to green

I am objecting to Site Reference 3081 A and 3081 B for the following reasons

The A 61 Leeds Road junction with Sharp Lane is a very well known accident blacks spot,also rush hour traffic on the Leeds Road junction with Sharp Lane queues as far back (over a mile) to the busy junction of the A61 Wood Lane and in the opposite direction back as far as Robin Hood Primary, (the only school in the area) the A 61 Leeds Road Junction with Sharp Lane queues as far back as the bridge over the M1 motorway (this can happen outside rush hour as well).!!!!

I have lived in this area for over 25 years and have seen the number of houses increase, BY OVER FIVE FOLD !!!!!

The old factory on Long Thorpe lane has been derelict for years and attracts anti- social behaviour, such as motor biking and fires, etc, why on earth not use this land to build on, and KEEP farm land for just that reason!!! ,it be would be a far better site and would IMPROVE THE LOCAL AREA ,NOT DETRACKED FROM IT!!,

Also there talk of the phasing of the two nearest fire station`s,if built on this would mean more houses with less cover!!

There IS NO DOCTORS IN ROBIN HOOD

There IS NO DENTISTS IN ROBIN HOOD

There IS ONLY ONE SCHOOL IN ROBIN HOOD

My last point is, I have received NO leaflet`s from LCC on the matter can someone tell me why!!!

Representation ID: REP05259 Question Ref: H1

I am objecting to Site Reference 3081 A and 3081 B for the following reasons

The A 61 Leeds Road junction with Sharp Lane is a very well known accident blacks spot,also rush hour traffic on the Leeds Road junction with Sharp Lane queues as far back (over a mile) to the busy junction of the A61 Wood Lane and in the opposite direction back as far as Robin Hood Primary, (the only school in the area) the A 61 Leeds Road Junction with Sharp Lane queues as far back as the bridge over the M1 motorway (this can happen outside rush hour as well).!!!!

I have lived in this area for over 25 years and have seen the number of houses increase, BY OVER FIVE FOLD !!!!!

The old factory on Long Thorpe lane has been derelict for years and attracts anti- social behaviour, such as motor biking and fires, etc, why on earth not use this land to build on, and KEEP farm land for just that reason!!! ,it be would be a far better site and would IMPROVE THE LOCAL AREA ,NOT DETRACKED FROM IT!!,

Also there talk of the phasing of the two nearest fire station`s,if built on this would mean more houses with less cover!!

There IS NO DOCTORS IN ROBIN HOOD

There IS NO DENTISTS IN ROBIN HOOD

There IS ONLY ONE SCHOOL IN ROBIN HOOD

My last point is, I have received NO leaflet`s from LCC on the matter can someone tell me why!!!

Name: Trevor & Margaret Ellis

Representor No: PRS02737

Representation ID: REP05266 Question Ref: H1

We object on these points.

Scale and size of the proposal.

Existing facilities could not cope with the extra demand.

The site is green belt and should be preserved.

Brown belt should be considered first.

Loss of farm land.

We would lose part of the famous rhubarb triangle.

The development is to large and local school are all ready at capacity and could not cope with the extra children.

Dentists and GPs could not cope with extra demand.

The development is in a rural location and is not suitable.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: JFC Haulage

Representor No: PRS02738

Representation ID: REP05267 Question Ref: H1

Objecting to green

I am objecting to for the following reasons:

THE MAIN REASON IS THE TRAFFIC AS WE ARE HAULAGE COMPANY WITH FIRST HAND KNOWLEDGE OF THIS AREA !!!

The A61 Leeds Road junction with Sharp Lane is a well known accident blacks spot along with the A61 Leeds Road junction with Lower Thorpe Lane ,also rush hour traffic on the Leeds Road junction with Sharp Lane queues as far back (over a mile) to the busy junction of the A61 Wood Lane and in the opposite direction back as far as as Robin Hood Primary Robinhood (the only school in the area) the A61 Leeds Road Junction with Sharp Lane queues as far back as the bridge over the M1 motorway (this can happen outside rush hour as well).

THIS IS ALSO YET ANOTHER REASON NOT TO

The old lead works on Leadwell Lane has currently been demolished and the land is an eye sore it attracts anti social behaviour such as , motor biking, travellers and is currently no use for ANYTHING whatsoever . Why propose to use land which is used to grow FOOD !!! and obviously keeps people in work why not use the above derelict land.

There has been talk of the Rothwell Fire Station and the Hunslet Fire Station both to be closed down.

Name: V Cunningham

Representor No: PRS02764

Representation ID: REP05307 Question Ref: H1

I object to the proposals for the above sites in Robin Hood and wish to make the following points:

This area has already been overdeveloped since I moved here in 1986 with hundreds of houses being built

Leeds Road/Sharp lane/Leadwell Lane are heavily congested in the morning and evening rush hour with traffic built up on all sides

The proposed fields(at present used for growing crops) separate the districts of Middleton and Robin Hood and building on these fields would merge Leeds and Wakefield

There are brownfield sites available nearby

Please takes these points into consideration

Name: Sarah Cunningham

Representor No: PRS02770

Representation ID: REP05313 Question Ref: H1

Objection to green

I would like to object to over 300 houses been built on this land.

I am concerned as local schools in Robin Hood and Rothwell are already over subscribed. I have a one year old child and a three year old child and have been told my three year old child may not get into a primary school in this area.

I am also concerned about the level of traffic in this area and the amount of accidents on the junction of Sharp Lane and Leeds road.

There has already been approx. 1700 houses been recently built just off Sharp Lane. Everyone has noticed the impact on the roads from these houses. Also at the moment there are houses under construction in Robin Hood just off Leeds Road.

There are also no doctors, dentists or a police station in this area. And there are proposals to close local fire stations.

{x}

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Faye/karl Goldsborough/donson

Representor No: PRS02798

Representation ID: REP04863 Question Ref: H1

We wish to register our complete opposition and objection against the proposed housing development sites 3081A and 3081B within Robin Hood Green Belt.

This cannot be allowed to proceed on Greenbelt agricultural land for the following reasons;

- The utility providers struggle already with current demand, we endure numerous power cuts and reduced water pressure on a regular basis which will be exacerbated with any potential increase in housing

- The local schools are already turning down applications from residents within Rothwell/Robin Hood due to oversubscription and instead allocating places in Middleton and other areas, this in itself is totally unacceptable for local residents not to mention another 373 households competing for school places

- Local Doctors/dentists cannot sustain a development of this size. Currently you cannot get an appointment within 2 weeks, can you imagine what impact another circa 700 people (that's just based on 2 inhabitants within each new home) would have?

- We don't have enough retail outlets to support this amount of housing, a small Morrisons supermarket and a few local shops will not be enough to cater for an additional 373 households and how will the subsequent waste they produce be managed?

- The local wildlife would suffer irreversibly. Deer/foxes/bees/field mice/birds/frogs all reside in the proposed development area, what will happen when you destroy their natural habitat? We have already seen the impact this has had in other areas where foxes who are starving have to scavenge for food in urban areas due to their diminishing habitat thus creating another problem for people to deal with.

- The level of pollution will increase, not to mention the impact it will have on current residents who will have to endure years of looking at a building site and noise/dust on a daily basis. We bought our houses on the basis that the fields were for agricultural purposes only, our fantastic views over the countryside will be wiped out so that a landowner and Council can profit and our house prices will plummet as a result.

- The area is rural and should stay that way, it forms part of the historical 'Rhubarb Triangle' which obviously is of no interest to Leeds council otherwise the land would not even have been considered.

- Leeds Council should be looking to regenerate areas within Leeds itself before turning to rural areas. Look at the area in Beeston; rows upon rows of terraced streets and high rise have been razed to the ground, why can't any future housing be built in these types of areas which already have the infrastructure in place to cope with demand and would have a positive impact on the local economy rather than local shops having to close because the houses have been demolished.

Miss Faye Goldsborough

39 Middleton Avenue

Rothwell

Leeds

LS26 OSE

Tel: 07765 255023

E-mail: Faye.goldsborough@sky.com

- The area is Green Belt for a reason, it should only be used for farming purposes. It serves as a boundary to villages and we need these open spaces to ensure we support our local farming communities who would otherwise be priced out of the area.

In summary we vehemently oppose any proposal to build on 3081A/3081B and we are extremely disgusted by the way Leeds Council has given local residents a complete disregard in these Site Allocations plans. If it wasn't for our local councillor then we would not have known these proposals were being put forward.

Please consider the points above as at the end of the day this all comes down to MONEY, the greedy fat cat landowners buying up Green Belt land in the hope that one day the council can be persuaded to change the useage to housing in exchange for money in their coffers, don't stoop to this level whereby you leave yourselves open to corruption and greed

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Faye/karl Goldsborough/donson

Representor No: PRS02798

Representation ID: REP05345 Question Ref: H1

Objection to green

We wish to register our complete opposition and objection against the proposed housing development sites 3081A and 3081B within Robin Hood Green Belt.

This cannot be allowed to proceed on Greenbelt agricultural land for the following reasons; The utility providers struggle already with current demand, we endure numerous power cuts and reduced water pressure on a regular basis which will be exacerbated with any potential increase in housing

The local schools are already turning down applications from residents within Rothwell/Robin Hood due to oversubscription and instead allocating places in Middleton and other areas, this in itself is totally unacceptable for local residents not to mention another 373 households competing for school places

Local Doctors/dentists cannot sustain a development of this size. Currently you cannot get an appointment within 2 weeks, can you imagine what impact another circa 700 people (that's just based on 2 inhabitants within each new home) would have?

We don't have enough retail outlets to support this amount of housing, a small Morrisons supermarket and a few local shops will not be enough to cater for an additional 373 households and how will the subsequent waste they produce be managed?

The local wildlife would suffer irreversibly. Deer/foxes/bees/field mice/birds/frogs all reside in the proposed development area, what will happen when you destroy their natural habitat? We have already seen the impact this has had in other areas where foxes who are starving have to scavenge for food in urban areas due to their diminishing habitat thus creating another problem for people to deal with.

The level of pollution will increase, not to mention the impact it will have on current residents who will have to endure years of looking at a building site and noise/dust on a daily basis. We bought our houses on the basis that the fields were for agricultural purposes only, our fantastic views over the countryside will be wiped out so that a landowner and Council can profit and our house prices will plummet as a result.

The area is rural and should stay that way, it forms part of the historical 'Rhubarb Triangle' which obviously is of no interest to Leeds council otherwise the land would not even have been considered.

Leeds Council should be looking to regenerate areas within Leeds itself before turning to rural areas. Look at the area in Beeston; rows upon rows of terraced streets and high rise have been razed to the ground, why can't any future housing be built in these types of areas which already have the infrastructure in place to cope with demand and would have a positive impact on the local economy rather than local shops having to close because the houses have been demolished.

The area is Green Belt for a reason, it should only be used for farming purposes. It serves as a boundary to villages and we need these open spaces to ensure we support our local farming communities who would otherwise be priced out of the area.

In summary we vehemently oppose any proposal to build on 3081A/3081B and we are extremely disgusted by the way Leeds Council has given local residents a complete disregard in these Site Allocations plans. If it wasn't for our local councillor then we would not have known these proposals were being put forward.

Please consider the points above as at the end of the day this all comes down to MONEY, the greedy fat cat landowners buying up Green Belt land in the hope that one day the Council can be 'persuaded' to change the usage to housing in exchange for money in their coffers, don't stoop to this level whereby you leave yourselves open to corruption and greed.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Caroline Grayson

Representor No: PRS02818

Representation ID: REP05370 Question Ref: H1

Objecting to green

[x]

Sent: 29 July 2013 16:02

To: LDF Leeds

Subject: Fwd: Site Reference: 3081 A and 3081 B Objection relating to proposed houses being built on Green Belt in Robin Hood

[x]

>> I am objecting to Site Reference 3081 A and 3081 B for the following reasons:

>>

>> We have lived in the area since 2008 and the amount of housing has increased by at least 50%.

There has been talk of both Rothwell and Hunslet Fire Stations to be closed down.

There is only one convenience store in the area.

>> The old lead works on Leadwell Lane has currently been demolished and the land is an eyesore it attracts anti social behaviour such as quadding, motor biking, fires, travellers and is currently no use for anything. Why commit land which is used to grow food and obviously keeps people in work to do this when you could use the above derelict land.

>> The A61 Leeds Road junction with Sharp Lane is a well known accident blacks spot along with the A61 Leeds Road junction with Lower Thorpe Lane also, rush hour traffic on the Leeds Road junction with Sharp Lane queues as far back (over a mile) to the busy junction of the A61 Wood Lane and in the opposite direction back as far as as Robin Hood Primary (the only school in the area) the A61 Leeds Road Junction with Sharp Lane queues as far back as the bridge over the M1 motorway (this can happen outside rush hour as well)

>>

>> Only 1 post office in the area and no doctors or dentist in the area.

[x]

Name: Ellis Mcewan

Representor No: PRS02824

Representation ID: REP05376 Question Ref: H1

Objecting to green

I am objecting to Site Reference 3081 A and 3081 B for the following reason

A61 Leeds Road junction with Sharp Lane is a well known an Accident blacks spot along with the A61 Leeds Road junction with Lower Thorpe Lane also, rush hour traffic on the Leeds Road junction with Sharp Lane queues as far back (over a mile) to the busy junction of the A61 Wood Lane and in the opposite direction back as far as as Robin Hood Primary (the only school in the area) the A61 Leeds Road Junction with Sharp Lane queues as far back as the bridge over the M1 motorway (this can happen outside rush hour as well)

The old lead works on Leadwell Lane has currently been demolished and the land is an EYESORE it attracts anti social behaviour such as quadding, motor biking, fires, travellers and is currently no use for ANYTHING Why commit land which is used to grow FOOD and obviously keeps people in work , when you could use the above derelict land

Only1 post office in the area

Only 1 village shop !!!!!

No doctors or dentist in the area.

Think of the impact on local GPs and dentist. I have lived and worked in this area since 1986 and the amount of houses has increased by 5 at least 5 fold

There has been talk of the Rothwell Fire Station and the Hunslet Fire Station both to be closed down.

Name: Clare Graham

Representor No: PRS02831

Representation ID: REP05383 Question Ref: H1

I would like to register my opinion to this site being allocated for housing for a number of reasons;

1. Size/scale of proposal detrimental to character of village

2. Volume of houses unsustainable by local amenities and roads and infrastructure

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: S Gledhill

Representor No: PRS02836

Representation ID: REP05388 Question Ref: H1

Objection to green

I am objecting to Site Reference 3081 A and 3081 B for the following reasons:
The A61 Leeds Road junction with Sharp Lane is a well known accident blacks spot along with the A61 Leeds Road junction with Lower Thorpe Lane ,also RUSH hour traffic on the Leeds Road junction with Sharp Lane queues as far back (over a mile) to the busy junction of the A61 Wood Lane and in the opposite direction back as far as as Robin Hood Primary RObin hood (the only school in the area) the A61 Leeds Road Junction with Sharp Lane queues as far back as the bridge over the M1 motorway (this can happen outside rush hour as well)!!!! The traffic on the A61 is horrendous !!!
The old lead works on Leadwell Lane has currently been demolished and the land is an eye sore it attracts anti social behaviour such as , motor biking, travellers and is currently no use for ANYTHING whatsoever . Why propose to use land which is used to grow FOOD !!! and obviously keeps people in work why not use the above derelict land. There has been talk of the Rothwell Fire Station and the Hunslet Fire Station both to be closed down.
Only 1 post office in the area.
No doctors or dentist in the Robinhood .
If this land is built on this will join Middleton & Robinhood .

Name: Sean Cunningham

Representor No: PRS03019

Representation ID: REP01939 Question Ref: H1

Urban Spral

Representation ID: REP01939 Question Ref: H5

3081a

Representation ID: REP01939 Question Ref: H2

3081a Sharp Lane/Wakefield Road Robin Hood.This land clearly divides and defines Robin Hood on the approach by car or foot from Bellisle.How do the council expect the HUNDREDS of new car journeys to take place !!The traffic lights at Wood Lane, Sharp lane and Halfway House are grid locked at peak times in the mornings and evenings, also at school times,Was it not enough to build on over 100 hundred acres further up Sharp Lane towards Thorpe Lane, WITHOUT sufficient affordable housing !, CONTRARY to its own policy,The only highway improvements were to Sharp Lane traffic light to ease the existing traffic problems PRE DEVELOPMENT !!Last but not least IT IS A FIELD, A Green FIELD !, green belt !, why do the council always take the easy box ticking, revenue raising £ option ! !.

Name: Dean Burling

Representor No: PRS03117

Representation ID: REP01657 Question Ref: H1

Site 3081 a&b are both green belt (as far as I am aware) and situated in the famous "rhubarb triangle". Building on this site would considerably change the look and feel of the village. There are other more appropriate sites in the area.

Representation ID: REP01657 Question Ref: H5

Site 3081 A&B. As outlined in question H2.

Representation ID: REP01657 Question Ref: H2

Site 3081 A&B. These sites have been proposed for the building of a considerable amount of houses. The small village of Robin Hood does not have the local facilities to support such a development. The local schools are already at capacity and would not be able to manage the increase in population. Due to recent smaller developments the traffic problem on the A61 has developed resulting in large queues. Further building would only increase this problem. Robin Hood is currently divided from the Middleton housing estate by the green belt and motorway. Building between these areas would provide access and cover for criminals and would result in an increase in crime in the area. There are much more appropriate areas to build around the Leeds area. The increase in house numbers would have a detrimental effect on the local house prices. Dentists and GP's which are already far too busy would not be able to cope with the increase in the local population. The plans show the site directly next to the street I live in. If this was the case the temptation may be to use my street as an access road to the site. This would cause numerous traffic problems due to how narrow the road is and parking issues. I strongly oppose a build of this size and scale and feel it would degrade the feel and character of the village.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Lucy Brook

Representor No: PRS03271

Representation ID: REP01208 Question Ref: H1

I believe the development of site references 3081 A&B are too large and would damage the village feel that we currently have in Robin Hood. Local schools such as Robin Hood and Carlton Primary do not have the capacity to cope with the extra children that this development would generate.

Representation ID: REP01208 Question Ref: H5

3081 A&B Loss of rural farmland Development too large for village and amenities to cope with Site is greenbelt land and should be preserved not developed Extensive housing would erode the separation of Middleton and Robin Hood which is the purpose of the green belt here.

Representation ID: REP01208 Question Ref: H8

301A This development would be too large for this small village and it's amenities to cope with

Representation ID: REP01208 Question Ref: H9

301A Green belt land Rural location Loss of farmland Harmful to character of the village Unsustainable Insufficient infrastructure in neighbouring villages to cope with development

Representation ID: REP01208 Question Ref: H2

3081A&B The site is greenbelt land and should be preserved. This development would also mean a loss of farmland and would lie in the centre of our famous Rhubarb Triangle. Robin Hood mainly consists of older properties which adds charm and character to the village. This character would be lost with the development of new build housing and would over dominate this small village. I believe the development of this rural farmland would be unsustainable and an eyesore.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Diane Freeman

Representor No: PRS03311

Representation ID: REP01378 Question Ref: H1

Please see comments below. I have had to edit them due to the 3000 character limit (which is completely insufficient. However, I will email a full copy of my objection. [Copied and enclosed]

[x] would like to strongly object to the planned housing site on green belt in Robin Hood (site reference 3081 A & B).

My first concern is the effect of the new buildings on the properties of Angel Row. This street is a row of old terrace cottages (built approximately 1890s) whose gardens face directly onto the proposed site. The new buildings would completely ruin the character of the area and these properties. Also, the view and privacy that is afforded to these houses from the field constitutes an important USP for the property. I feel that the loss of both of these aspects would cause a significant depreciation in the value of the properties should the new housing be built. Our houses are generally valued at more than the 'average' terraced property due to the location and this value would be completely lost at a great cost to the residents. This depreciation would be in addition to the normal depreciation in property prices where new developments are built.

I also have other concerns regarding the properties. I would like to make it clear that there is an access right at the back of the properties (albeit overgrown at the moment). My property extends past the fence at the bottom of the garden and I hope that the planners are aware of this fact. There is also the issue of drainage. I am very concerned that a new housing development would lead to flooding. Angel Row properties all have cellars and if these were to flood then it could cause great damage to the houses. I would also like to make it clear that there is no drainage at the back of the properties. All water is carried away from the house by a drain away pipe which drains into the field. Please consider the effect on the properties if this land was covered by houses.

Secondly, I firmly believe that the development is not appropriate for the area. This is a semi-rural location, and the amenities and infrastructure are set up for this. The local schools are at capacity. The local roads cannot accept a significant rise in traffic - there are already traffic jams each morning and evening. The development is also not suitable in terms of character. Despite being halfway between Leeds and Wakefield, this area retains a village identity and feel. The proposal is for 373 houses - this is an excessive quantity which is not supportable.

Also, the land is designated green belt land - and for a good reason. It serves to separate the areas of Robin Hood and Middleton, allowing each to retain their separate identity. Since I have lived in this area, it has always been fully productive arable land. According to one source, it is also subject to a covenant which ensures it is used for arable land. Currently, this has yet to be substantiated but I can guarantee that it will be thoroughly researched.

I also believe that we had not been given adequate notification of this development. We received a letter on 25th July from someone who lives in the area. The consultation period started 3rd June, and objections have to be submitted by 29th July. This gives us just 2 working days to object. It is my opinion that this proposal has not been adequately advertised as neither I nor any of my neighbours had heard of it. It is completely impossible to have a street closer to the development than Angel Row as the proposed plan boundaries border ours. However, there has been no letter and no notices (and we have carefully checked). If it hadn't been for a kindly and pro-active resident of this area then we would never have known.

The main problem with only having 2 working days to object is that many of the homeowners in Angel Row will not be able to object. Many of the houses are tenanted, which means that the landlords are dependent on the tenants notifying them - unlikely in the time frame that is available. Also, a couple of the homeowners are away, and will not be returning before the deadline. In addition, this does not give me time to complete the research required to submit a full and complete objection. The depreciation in my house value is obvious, yet without more time, I am unable to quantify the figures. This would be ideally done with the help and experience of local estate agents. Secondly, I do not have the time to fully investigate the afore mentioned covenant, which means I am forced into a position whereby I am having to object without all the relevant facts.

I fully appreciate that there is a housing shortage and that new properties must be built. However, I feel that this development would ruin this area, is completely unsupportable and unsustainable and that there is other, more appropriate, land available. I fully intend to pursue this objection and will continue to investigate both the house prices and possibility of a covenant on the land.

I look forward to hearing your reply to this objection and expect to have all my points considered and responded to individually.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Diane Freeman

Representor No: PRS03311

Representation ID: REP01378 Question Ref: H2

I would like to strongly object to the planned housing on site 3081 A & B. Consider the effect on Angel Row (built 1890s), whose gardens face directly onto the site. New buildings would ruin the character of the area and properties. The view and privacy these houses have is a vital USP for the property. I feel that the loss of both of these aspects would cause a significant depreciation in their value at great cost to the residents. I also have other concerns regarding the properties. I would like to make it clear that there is an access right at the back of the properties. My property extends past the fence at the end of the garden. There is also the issue of drainage. I am very concerned that a housing development would cause flooding. Angel Row properties have cellars and if these were to flood then it could cause great damage. I would also like to make it clear that there is no drainage at the back of the properties. All rain water is carried away from the house by a pipe which drains into the field. Please consider the effect on the properties if the land was covered by houses. Secondly, I firmly believe that the development is not appropriate for the area. It is a semi-rural location and infrastructure reflects this. The schools are at capacity. The local roads cannot accept a significant rise in traffic - there are already traffic jams morning and evening. The development is also not suitable in terms of character. Despite being halfway between Leeds and Wakefield, the area has a village identity. The proposal is 373 houses - an excessive quantity which is not supportable. Also, the land is green belt land, separating Robin Hood and Middleton, allowing each to retain their identity. According to one source, it is also subject to a covenant which ensures it is used for arable land. Currently, this has yet to be substantiated but I guarantee that it will be thoroughly researched. I also believe that we had not had adequate notification. We received a letter on 25th July. The consultation period is from 3rd June to 29th July. This gave us just 2 working days. This proposal has not been adequately advertised as neither I nor any of my neighbours had heard of it. It is impossible to have a street closer to the development as the proposed plan boundaries border ours. However, there has been no notices. The main problem with this is that many of the homeowners will not be able to object. Many of the houses are tenanted, so the owners are dependent on tenants notifying them. Also, a couple of the owners are away, and do not return before the 29th. In addition, it does not give me time to complete the research required for a thorough objection. The loss in house value is obvious, yet I am unable to quantify the figures and I do not have time to investigate the covenant. I feel that this development would ruin this area, is completely unsupportable and unsustainable and that there is other, more appropriate, land available.

Name: David Davenport

Representor No: PRS03523

Representation ID: REP05585 Question Ref: General comment

Objection to green

I am writing to register my protest against the building of 373 new houses on green belt land in Robin Hood.

I believe that until all existing empty properties have been brought back into use (by compulsory purchase if necessary) and all brown field land has been exhausted - we should not be considering building on our treasured green belt land. We need to re-develop our existing unused homes not build new ones. Existing empty houses can be brought back into use, converted into flats, unused commercial premises into houses/flats etc.

Green belt land should be preserved for everyone, once it has gone, we can never get it back.

Hands off our green belt land.

Yours faithfully

Paul Robinson

P.S. This is your chance to renew my faith in politicians and local democracy

Name: Roger Downing

Representor No: PRS04229

Representation ID: REP01799 Question Ref: G1

SITE REF3081A & B This site is on green belt and should be preserved other sites including brown fields should be considered first

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: James Barnsley

Representor No: PRS04266

Representation ID: REP01978 Question Ref: H1

I am writing to formally oppose the proposal to build 373 houses on the green belt in Robin Hood. I am disgusted that this land has even been considered for such massive development, this is agricultural green belt land, why haven't other brown field areas been considered first? Robin hood is rural village which is within the world famous rhubarb triangle, this development would completely ruin the area and affect the value of houses. I live right next to the proposed site, I do not want to live next to a loud dirty building site. The noise alone will completely disrupt my working life as I work from home. 373 houses are not going to be built over night, the constant noise from groundwork's, heavy plant and generators will be unbearable and I'm sure will de value my property. The country side around my house is what attracted me to this area 8 years ago. I regularly see foxes, Deer and other wildlife in the area, have the environmental implications been considered? Building 373 houses in this area is ridiculous, there has already been a huge amount of housing development in the area in recent years, New forest Village, the Castlefields development, Lofthouse park. This will completely saturate the local area, there would be massive increase in traffic volume, pollution, there will be no local school places, GP places. Crime rates in the area will increase, during the building work and afterwards if houses are sat empty, which there will be.

Representation ID: REP01978 Question Ref: H3

I am writing to formally oppose the proposal to build 373 houses on the green belt in Robin Hood. I am disgusted that this land has even been considered for such massive development, this is agricultural green belt land, why haven't other brown field areas been considered first? Robin hood is rural village which is within the world famous rhubarb triangle, this development would completely ruin the area and affect the value of houses. I live right next to the proposed site, I do not want to live next to a loud dirty building site. The noise alone will completely disrupt my working life as I work from home. 373 houses are not going to be built over night, the constant noise from groundwork's, heavy plant and generators will be unbearable and I'm sure will de value my property. The country side around my house is what attracted me to this area 8 years ago. I regularly see foxes, Deer and other wildlife in the area, have the environmental implications been considered? Building 373 houses in this area is ridiculous, there has already been a huge amount of housing development in the area in recent years, New forest Village, the Castlefields development, Lofthouse park. This will completely saturate the local area, there would be massive increase in traffic volume, pollution, there will be no local school places, GP places. Crime rates in the area will increase, during the building work and afterwards if houses are sat empty, which there will be.

Representation ID: REP01978 Question Ref: H4

I am writing to formally oppose the proposal to build 373 houses on the green belt in Robin Hood. I am disgusted that this land has even been considered for such massive development, this is agricultural green belt land, why haven't other brown field areas been considered first? Robin hood is rural village which is within the world famous rhubarb triangle, this development would completely ruin the area and affect the value of houses. I live right next to the proposed site, I do not want to live next to a loud dirty building site. The noise alone will completely disrupt my working life as I work from home. 373 houses are not going to be built over night, the constant noise from groundwork's, heavy plant and generators will be unbearable and I'm sure will de value my property. The country side around my house is what attracted me to this area 8 years ago. I regularly see foxes, Deer and other wildlife in the area, have the environmental implications been considered? Building 373 houses in this area is ridiculous, there has already been a huge amount of housing development in the area in recent years, New forest Village, the Castlefields development, Lofthouse park. This will completely saturate the local area, there would be massive increase in traffic volume, pollution, there will be no local school places, GP places. Crime rates in the area will increase, during the building work and afterwards if houses are sat empty, which there will be.

Representation ID: REP01978 Question Ref: H5

I am writing to formally oppose the proposal to build 373 houses on the green belt in Robin Hood. I am disgusted that this land has even been considered for such massive development, this is agricultural green belt land, why haven't other brown field areas been considered first? Robin hood is rural village which is within the world famous rhubarb triangle, this development would completely ruin the area and affect the value of houses. I live right next to the proposed site, I do not want to live next to a loud dirty building site. The noise alone will completely disrupt my working life as I work from home. 373 houses are not going to be built over night, the constant noise from groundwork's, heavy plant and generators will be unbearable and I'm sure will de value my property. The country side around my house is what attracted me to this area 8 years ago. I regularly see foxes, Deer and other wildlife in the area, have the environmental implications been considered? Building 373 houses in this area is ridiculous, there has already been a huge amount of housing development in the area in recent years, New forest Village, the Castlefields development, Lofthouse park. This will completely saturate the local area, there would be massive increase in traffic volume, pollution, there will be no local school places, GP places. Crime rates in the area will increase, during the building work and afterwards if houses are sat empty, which there will be.

Representation ID: REP01978 Question Ref: H6

I am writing to formally oppose the proposal to build 373 houses on the green belt in Robin Hood. I am disgusted that this land has even been considered for such massive development, this is agricultural green belt land, why haven't other brown field areas been considered first? Robin hood is rural village which is within the world famous rhubarb triangle, this development would completely ruin the area and affect the value of houses. I live right next to the proposed site, I do not want to live next to a loud dirty building site. The noise alone will completely disrupt my working life as I work from home. 373 houses are not going to be built over night, the constant noise from groundwork's, heavy plant and generators will be unbearable and I'm sure will de value my property. The country side around my house is what attracted me to this area 8 years ago. I regularly see foxes, Deer and other wildlife in the area, have the environmental implications been considered? Building 373 houses in this area is ridiculous, there has already been a huge amount of housing development in the area in recent years, New forest Village, the Castlefields development, Lofthouse park. This will completely saturate the local area, there would be massive increase in traffic volume, pollution, there will be no local school places, GP places. Crime rates in the area will increase, during the building work and afterwards if houses are sat empty, which there will be.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: James Barnsley

Representor No: PRS04266

Representation ID: REP01978 Question Ref: H7

I am writing to formally oppose the proposal to build 373 houses on the green belt in Robin Hood. I am disgusted that this land has even been considered for such massive development, this is agricultural green belt land, why haven't other brown field areas been considered first? Robin hood is rural village which is within the world famous rhubarb triangle, this development would completely ruin the area and affect the value of houses. I live right next to the proposed site, I do not want to live next to a loud dirty building site. The noise alone will completely disrupt my working life as I work from home. 373 houses are not going to be built over night, the constant noise from groundwork's, heavy plant and generators will be unbearable and I'm sure will de value my property. The country side around my house is what attracted me to this area 8 years ago. I regularly see foxes, Deer and other wildlife in the area, have the environmental implications been considered? Building 373 houses in this area is ridiculous, there has already been a huge amount of housing development in the area in recent years, New forest Village, the Castlefields development, Lofthouse park. This will completely saturate the local area, there would be massive increase in traffic volume, pollution, there will be no local school places, GP places. Crime rates in the area will increase, during the building work and afterwards if houses are sat empty, which there will be.

Representation ID: REP01978 Question Ref: H8

I am writing to formally oppose the proposal to build 373 houses on the green belt in Robin Hood. I am disgusted that this land has even been considered for such massive development, this is agricultural green belt land, why haven't other brown field areas been considered first? Robin hood is rural village which is within the world famous rhubarb triangle, this development would completely ruin the area and affect the value of houses. I live right next to the proposed site, I do not want to live next to a loud dirty building site. The noise alone will completely disrupt my working life as I work from home. 373 houses are not going to be built over night, the constant noise from groundwork's, heavy plant and generators will be unbearable and I'm sure will de value my property. The country side around my house is what attracted me to this area 8 years ago. I regularly see foxes, Deer and other wildlife in the area, have the environmental implications been considered? Building 373 houses in this area is ridiculous, there has already been a huge amount of housing development in the area in recent years, New forest Village, the Castlefields development, Lofthouse park. This will completely saturate the local area, there would be massive increase in traffic volume, pollution, there will be no local school places, GP places. Crime rates in the area will increase, during the building work and afterwards if houses are sat empty, which there will be.

Representation ID: REP01978 Question Ref: H9

I am writing to formally oppose the proposal to build 373 houses on the green belt in Robin Hood. I am disgusted that this land has even been considered for such massive development, this is agricultural green belt land, why haven't other brown field areas been considered first? Robin hood is rural village which is within the world famous rhubarb triangle, this development would completely ruin the area and affect the value of houses. I live right next to the proposed site, I do not want to live next to a loud dirty building site. The noise alone will completely disrupt my working life as I work from home. 373 houses are not going to be built over night, the constant noise from groundwork's, heavy plant and generators will be unbearable and I'm sure will de value my property. The country side around my house is what attracted me to this area 8 years ago. I regularly see foxes, Deer and other wildlife in the area, have the environmental implications been considered? Building 373 houses in this area is ridiculous, there has already been a huge amount of housing development in the area in recent years, New forest Village, the Castlefields development, Lofthouse park. This will completely saturate the local area, there would be massive increase in traffic volume, pollution, there will be no local school places, GP places. Crime rates in the area will increase, during the building work and afterwards if houses are sat empty, which there will be.

Representation ID: REP01978 Question Ref: H10

I am writing to formally oppose the proposal to build 373 houses on the green belt in Robin Hood. I am disgusted that this land has even been considered for such massive development, this is agricultural green belt land, why haven't other brown field areas been considered first? Robin hood is rural village which is within the world famous rhubarb triangle, this development would completely ruin the area and affect the value of houses. I live right next to the proposed site, I do not want to live next to a loud dirty building site. The noise alone will completely disrupt my working life as I work from home. 373 houses are not going to be built over night, the constant noise from groundwork's, heavy plant and generators will be unbearable and I'm sure will de value my property. The country side around my house is what attracted me to this area 8 years ago. I regularly see foxes, Deer and other wildlife in the area, have the environmental implications been considered? Building 373 houses in this area is ridiculous, there has already been a huge amount of housing development in the area in recent years, New forest Village, the Castlefields development, Lofthouse park. This will completely saturate the local area, there would be massive increase in traffic volume, pollution, there will be no local school places, GP places. Crime rates in the area will increase, during the building work and afterwards if houses are sat empty, which there will be.

Representation ID: REP01978 Question Ref: H12

No I am writing to formally oppose the proposal to build 373 houses on the green belt in Robin Hood. I am disgusted that this land has even been considered for such massive development, this is agricultural green belt land, why haven't other brown field areas been considered first? Robin hood is rural village which is within the world famous rhubarb triangle, this development would completely ruin the area and affect the value of houses. I live right next to the proposed site, I do not want to live next to a loud dirty building site. The noise alone will completely disrupt my working life as I work from home. 373 houses are not going to be built over night, the constant noise from groundwork's, heavy plant and generators will be unbearable and I'm sure will de value my property. The country side around my house is what attracted me to this area 8 years ago. I regularly see foxes, Deer and other wildlife in the area, have the environmental implications been considered? Building 373 houses in this area is ridiculous, there has already been a huge amount of housing development in the area in recent years, New forest Village, the Castlefields development, Lofthouse park. This will completely saturate the local area, there would be massive increase in traffic volume, pollution, there will be no local school places, GP places. Crime rates in the area will increase, during the building work and afterwards if houses are sat empty, which there will be.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: James Barnsley

Representor No: PRS04266

Representation ID: REP01978 Question Ref: General comment

I am writing to formally oppose the proposal to build 373 houses on the green belt in Robin Hood. I am disgusted that this land has even been considered for such massive development, this is agricultural green belt land, why haven't other brown field area's been considered first? Robin hood is rural village which is within the world famous rhubarb triangle, this development would completely ruin the area and affect the value of houses. I live right next to the proposed site, I do not want to live next to a loud dirty building site. The noise alone will completely disrupt my working life as I work from home. 373 houses are not going to be built over night, the constant noise from groundwork's, heavy plant and generators will be unbearable and I'm sure will de value my property. The country side around my house is what attracted me to this area 8 years ago. I regularly see foxes, Deer and other wildlife in the area, have the environmental implications been considered? Building 373 houses in this area is ridiculous, there has already been a huge amount of housing development in the area in recent years, New forest Village, the Castlefields development, Lofthouse park. This will completely saturate the local area, there would be massive increase in traffic volume, pollution, there will be no local school places, GP places. Crime rates in the area will increase, during the building work and afterwards if houses are sat empty, which there will be.

Representation ID: REP01978 Question Ref: H2

3081 A A & B I am writing to formally oppose the proposal to build 373 houses on the green belt in Robin Hood. I am disgusted that this land has even been considered for such massive development, this is agricultural green belt land, why haven't other brown field area's been considered first? Robin hood is rural village which is within the world famous rhubarb triangle, this development would completely ruin the area and affect the value of houses. I live right next to the proposed site, I do not want to live next to a loud dirty building site. The noise alone will completely disrupt my working life as I work from home. 373 houses are not going to be built over night, the constant noise from groundwork's, heavy plant and generators will be unbearable and I'm sure will de value my property. The country side around my house is what attracted me to this area 8 years ago. I regularly see foxes, Deer and other wildlife in the area, have the environmental implications been considered? Building 373 houses in this area is ridiculous, there has already been a huge amount of housing development in the area in recent years, New forest Village, the Castlefields development, Lofthouse park. This will completely saturate the local area, there would be massive increase in traffic volume, pollution, there will be no local school places, GP places. Crime rates in the area will increase, during the building work and afterwards if houses are sat empty, which there will be.

Name: Neil Whitwell

Representor No: PRS04269

Representation ID: REP01656 Question Ref: H1

the areas been considered for housing, specifically 3081A and 3081B are in already congested areas would not be able to cope with the extra volume of traffic and the extra school places needed

Representation ID: REP01656 Question Ref: H2

Site Ref 3081A and 3081B, Robin hood has had many new housing developments over the recent years included, one on going now "The Rowans". this has greatly affected the area in term of traffic, schools and other facilities like doctors and dentists. Anymore housing in the area would cause massive impacts on already busy roads, recent traffic lights at sharp lane and Leadwell lane junctions have improved the accident rate but these are still dangerous junctions, add the extra volume of cars into the mix and it would be back to been as dangerous as before. Plus the local road are congested enough without added to it. School places for local children is a big issue, many cannot get into the already full Robin Hood Primary, Carlton Primary and Rodillian Schools. how would it cope with children from another 373 homes. As for GP's and dentists, it takes a small miracle to get a appointment at Rothwell's Market Cross surgery at the moment and it well known the shortage of NHS dentist places. Village boundaries are been erode by new developments, these proposed sites would eliminate a divide between Rodin Hood and Middleton.

Name: Douglas Reid

Representor No: PRS04388

Representation ID: REP01386 Question Ref: H2

3081a&b...Local schools doctors etc unable to cope with a influx of new housing of this magnitude,also this development will further encroach on our rapidly dwindling green belt....

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Geoffrey Sutcliffe

Representor No: PRS04821

Representation ID: REP01504 Question Ref: H1

I object to land at site 3081A being classified as 'green'; in the site allocation plan for the following reasons. 1) The land at site 3081A is arable land classed as Green Belt land. There are nationwide concerns about the miles our food travels before it arrives in our shops so it is outrageous that productive farmland is being considered as building plots. 2) The decision to potentially allow the building of 373 houses on this site would put undue pressure on the infrastructure of this existing village and by in effect joining the area onto Middleton create an area of urban sprawl which would be totally inappropriate in this area. 3) At peak hours the congestion on the A61 is already heavy and this would significantly increase with the addition of almost 400 extra homes. Also the bus service (no 110) is often currently full by the time it arrives in Robin Hood at peak times and my wife has to wait for up to 3 buses before ones arrives that she can board. 4) Up to 400 homes suggests that at least 300 children will need schooling and play areas. There is already an issue in our area concerning children hanging around on the streets. Also the local schools are at capacity.

Representation ID: REP01504 Question Ref: H5

I object to land at site 3081A being classified as 'green'; in the site allocation plan for the following reasons. 1) The land at site 3081A is arable land classed as Green Belt land. There are nationwide concerns about the miles our food travels before it arrives in our shops so it is outrageous that productive farmland is being considered as building plots. 2) The decision to potentially allow the building of 373 houses on this site would put undue pressure on the infrastructure of this existing village and by in effect joining the area onto Middleton create an area of urban sprawl which would be totally inappropriate in this area. 3) At peak hours the congestion on the A61 is already heavy and this would significantly increase with the addition of almost 400 extra homes. Also the bus service (no 110) is often currently full by the time it arrives in Robin Hood at peak times and my wife has to wait for up to 3 buses before ones arrives that she can board. 4) Up to 400 homes suggests that at least 300 children will need schooling and play areas. There is already an issue in our area concerning children hanging around on the streets. Also the local schools are at capacity.

Representation ID: REP01504 Question Ref: H8

I object to land at site 3081A being classified as 'green'; in the site allocation plan for the following reasons. 1) The land at site 3081A is arable land classed as Green Belt land. There are nationwide concerns about the miles our food travels before it arrives in our shops so it is outrageous that productive farmland is being considered as building plots. 2) The decision to potentially allow the building of 373 houses on this site would put undue pressure on the infrastructure of this existing village and by in effect joining the area onto Middleton create an area of urban sprawl which would be totally inappropriate in this area. 3) At peak hours the congestion on the A61 is already heavy and this would significantly increase with the addition of almost 400 extra homes. Also the bus service (no 110) is often currently full by the time it arrives in Robin Hood at peak times and my wife has to wait for up to 3 buses before ones arrives that she can board. 4) Up to 400 homes suggests that at least 300 children will need schooling and play areas. There is already an issue in our area concerning children hanging around on the streets. Also the local schools are at capacity.

Representation ID: REP01504 Question Ref: General comment

I object to land at site 3081A being classified as 'green'; in the site allocation plan for the following reasons. 1) The land at site 3081A is arable land classed as Green Belt land. There are nationwide concerns about the miles our food travels before it arrives in our shops so it is outrageous that productive farmland is being considered as building plots. 2) The decision to potentially allow the building of 373 houses on this site would put undue pressure on the infrastructure of this existing village and by in effect joining the area onto Middleton create an area of urban sprawl which would be totally inappropriate in this area. 3) At peak hours the congestion on the A61 is already heavy and this would significantly increase with the addition of almost 400 extra homes. Also the bus service (no 110) is often currently full by the time it arrives in Robin Hood at peak times and my wife has to wait for up to 3 buses before ones arrives that she can board. 4) Up to 400 homes suggests that at least 300 children will need schooling and play areas. There is already an issue in our area concerning children hanging around on the streets. Also the local schools are at capacity.

Representation ID: REP01504 Question Ref: H2

I object to land at site 3081A being classified as 'green'; in the site allocation plan for the following reasons. 1) The land at site 3081A is arable land classed as Green Belt land. There are nationwide concerns about the miles our food travels before it arrives in our shops so it is outrageous that productive farmland is being considered as building plots. 2) The decision to potentially allow the building of 373 houses on this site would put undue pressure on the infrastructure of this existing village and by in effect joining the area onto Middleton create an area of urban sprawl which would be totally inappropriate in this area. 3) At peak hours the congestion on the A61 is already heavy and this would significantly increase with the addition of almost 400 extra homes. Also the bus service (no 110) is often currently full by the time it arrives in Robin Hood at peak times and my wife has to wait for up to 3 buses before ones arrives that she can board. 4) Up to 400 homes suggests that at least 300 children will need schooling and play areas. There is already an issue in our area concerning children hanging around on the streets. Also the local schools are at capacity.

Name: Sian Prowle

Representor No: PRS05044

Representation ID: REP05612 Question Ref: H1

3081 A & B

1. No residents consulted or informed until 2 days ago! Why no meetings? Communication?

2. Green Belt last resort! Brownfield should be considered first!!

Detrimental affect for wildlife, beautiful view, many wildlife inhabit this land, RURAL location, Harmful to character of village. Impact on schools, GPS, Loss of farmland, ruins the view for residents.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Paul Hill

Representor No: PRS05078

Representation ID: REP05646 Question Ref: H1

I am objecting to Site Reference 3081 A and 3081 B

The A61 Leeds Road junction with Sharp Lane is a very well known for accidents ,also rush hour traffic on the Leeds Road junction with sharp lane queues as far back to the junction of the A61 Wood Lane and in the opposite direction back as far as Robin Hood Primary, (the only school in the area) the A 61 Leeds Road Junction with Sharp Lane queues as far back as the bridge over the M1 motorway this can happen any time of the day

I have lived in this area for nearly 11 years and have seen the number of houses increase, 200% !!!!!

only 1 school in robin hood, and no doctors, no dentists either!!!
Also there is talk of closing the two nearest fire station's, !

Name: Gordon And Linda Walker

Representor No: PRS05464

Representation ID: REP06091 Question Ref: H1

Firstly being given only two working days to digest is quite unfair. For comment by all in Middleton Avenue, bad planning. Middleton Lane which leads of Middleton Avenue is our route to the main road, over the years it has been very hard making access to proceed any journey due to traffic since all the building of homes along this road. Turning left takes you to Leeds, turning right takes you to Wakefield, we really don't need more houses resulting in more traffic. It is actually nice to see farms and fields instead of a concrete jungle, if we wanted that there is centre of Leeds.

More houses, especially estates, brings problems of large families, many cars per household, teenagers not knowing what to do with themselves as there is nothing else for them to do but hang around in groups on corners appearing threatening. Our GP surgery is running to full capacity, hard to get appointments as it is, same as our dentist, to take away the fields, farms, and rural look of our areas would make it undesirable, look the same as any other area, whereas at present we consider ourselves most fortunate to be surrounded by fields, you come home from work and leave the concrete jungle behind and you actually feel that you have done so.

It is fairly private where we are and we are cut off from large groupings of houses and hope to remain that way. Our road at the top (A61) just cannot cope with more cars especially during rush hour and when kids are at school.

We have viewed the plans and proposals online and with so little time to digest and investigate have found it quite confusing. The farm behind our house grows veg, new owners, we are hoping they have not sold off a parcel of land which would otherwise be used for growing crops. 373 homes in any one area is unthinkable.

Along the road previously mentioned is just unthinkable, especially during rush hour where traffic comes to a stop. We would ask that the rural look not be taken away in such a desirable area. Keep green fields, free up our roads, not put further pressure on our local GPs, dentists, corner shops and schools, Middleton Avenue is just a little road tucked out the way, to have this change in a drastic way would be terrible, some have lived here all their lives. The impact so far we have experienced is by development immediately having been built along A61 especially from Rothwell Haigh on route to Wakefield and even at present there is a development in process. We are just one household but we speak for our whole Avenue who are most worried of any impending impact.

Please, we oppose all buildings near Rothwell Haigh and surrounding areas.

Name: Melvyn Nock

Representor No: PRS05467

Representation ID: REP06095 Question Ref: H1

3081A

I don't agree that you are going to build 373 houses on green belt land in Robin Hood. I have lived in Robin hood for 28 years I can't imagine having so many houses built near to where we live on such a peaceful and rural setting.

Name: Shirley Crowther

Representor No: PRS05474

Representation ID: REP06107 Question Ref: H1

Not happy with loss of greenbelt and number of houses planned (373) will cause too much volume of traffic, had enough already. Could local schools cope with influx not to mention GP surgeries?

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H1

3081 A (and 3081 B in Inner South) Hope Farm – I disagree with the designation of these sites (which have been artificially split between SHMCAs) as Green. They should be Red. These sites are Green Belt and are currently in agricultural use. The scale of housing put forward here – 374 houses – would irrevocably change the character of Robin Hood. It would erode the separation between the communities of Robin Hood, Middleton and Rothwell Haigh. The sheer volume of houses proposed on this one site is unsustainable given that the local schools (Primary and Secondary) are full already, that the Doctors surgery is at capacity and that the shopping facilities in the village are limited.

Name: Local Resident

Representor No: PRS05762

Representation ID: REP06436 Question Ref: H1

To whom it may concern,
As a local resident of Rothwell Haigh, I would like to voice my concern against the planning of application 3081AandB.
I am against any proposal for new residential buildings close to my area.
Yours faithfully,
Local Resident

Name: Julia Marshall

Representor No: PRS05782

Representation ID: REP06467 Question Ref: H1

3081 A & B Proposal to build 373 properties on Green Belt off the A61 at Robin Hood
I have only just been advised of the proposal to build on Green Belt at Robin Hood.
I am strongly this proposed development, the fields along the A61 are a small green lung in a very developed area of South Leeds, and in my opinion Green Belt should only be used as a last resort, and I am not convinced all other options have been explored. Over the years the small patches of Green around Robin Hood and Rothwell Haigh have been infilled with small housing estates, joining up into Ribbon development.
The A61 is already an extremely busy through route from Wakefield to Leeds and there have been numerous additional Residential New Build accessing what is a congested road,
There is a School in the area where it is already very hazardous for the children to cross the road and it would be intolerable to add the cars from nearly 400 houses.
I live not far away but visit my family often and the traffic can already be horrendous.
I trust my feeling about this development can be added to others also against

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Wayne & Hayley Baker

Representor No: PRS05783

Representation ID: REP06468 Question Ref: H1

RE: Appeal against housing site 3081 A & B

Me and My husband have lived on Middleton for 15 years now and have a 3 year old boy and we are expecting our 2nd child in February 14. This is our 1st house and chose it mainly due to its location and having a private street overlooking the football pitch and views over the fields. we so wish to continue living like here for a long time like this. We love our street and our neighbours and our little boy frequently plays on the street with his friends and ourselves,

We strongly appeal against the proposed plans for 373 houses to be built adjoining the top of our street, we are devastated by the plans. The planned build and new road joining onto our street Middleton Avenue would increase the traffic on the avenue to dangerous levels for my little boy and all the children on our street that lovely playing in a safe environment and would cause increased pollution and noise.

Primary schools in Rothwell and Robinhood are over subscribed for the area, and the planned site for 3081 A & B will force local children out of our village into primary schools that are not in the area as there are not enough places in schools and will cause real hardship and stress for families just wanting their children to go to a local village school. How do the council propose to compensate for the extra places in schools that will be required with the build of 373 houses? Ourselves having children and all the neighbourhood with children are really concerned and worried about this.

Other sites, including Brownfield should be considered first, the site is on green belt and should be preserved, the proposed site would have a devastating effect on wildlife in the field and loss of farmland. The large volume of houses would cause a large increase in the traffic on our avenue which is dangerous for pedestrians and also on Leeds/Wakefield road which cannot be sustained.

The proposed site would sadly have a negative effect on the character of the village, as it is increasing amounts of fields are disappearing which add to the appealing character of the area, and there would be no separation between Robin Hood and Middleton.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Wendy & Stephen Pritchard

Representor No: PRS05784

Representation ID: REP06470 Question Ref: H1

I am emailing to lodge a formal objection to the planned sites 3081A and 3081B in addition to all of the land around this area getting removed from the Greenbelt.

1. The excessive size of this development will harm the character of the village, the number of new families would destroy what is already a pushed to the limit local community.
2. Existing facilities and infrastructure would not cope. I live on Middleton Avenue and already have frequent issues with my water pressure, there is no way that the existing infrastructure would be able to support a development of 100 houses let alone 373.
3. This land is green belt land, when I bought my house it had a certain value because it is close to green belt land, I find it totally abhorrent that you are removing the greenbelt from all of the land around me. Especially as this land was sold initially as for agricultural purposes only and this was advertised on all of the hoarding boards when the site was up for sale.
4. Brownfield sites which are available should be considered prior to dismantling all of the green belt.
5. The land has been a farm for over 100 years, I find it totally irresponsible that you think it is your place to destroy what has been built up for 100's of years for the sake of a housing estate that no one in the local area wants. This will also increase the distance food has to travel to get from farm to shelf, therefore increasing carbon emissions and negatively impacting the environment.
6. This will severely affect the value of my property, are you going to compensate me for that?
7. The land is of local and national significance, this is in the middle of the rhubarb triangle which is world famous.
8. Local Schools (Robin Hood, Carlton, Rodillian) are already stretched to capacity as are local medical facilities such as dentists and doctors. There is no capacity for an increase of any kind let alone the massive development that you're planning, it is already a struggle to even get a doctors or dentist appointment, let alone with an additional 800-1000 people in the area.
9. The A61 road is queuing all the time at rush hour as it is for miles back, there is simply not capacity on this road (or sharp lane) for the additional proposed houses.
10. This development is on agricultural/rural land and should not be allowed, this is not sustainable nor is it responsible development.
11. Extensive housing on this planned site would seriously erode the split between Middleton/Rothwell/Robin Hood, this is a key part and feature of the green belt. In summary I do not want this development, no one in the local area wants this development and it is 100% suspect that this was not publicised in any way other than a short article which has to be searched for on your website

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: L Inglis

Representor No: PRS05785

Representation ID: REP06472 Question Ref: H1

SITE REF: 3081 A / 3081 B

Please accept this forwarded email as 100% opposition from ALL THE RESIDENTS FROM MIDDLETON LANE AND MIDDLETON AVENUE . Many residents are elderly and do not have internet access and some are unable to get the opposition in by post as we have all just found out about this development proposal. So this email represents their joint opposition to the proposals.

I would kindly like to have a list of newspapers, circulars, internet web addresses, posters, advertisers etc and dates of listings together with examples of all media used by the council, to advise citizens about this development as NO ONE had seen or heard anything about the proposal until yesterday around 3pm.

I would kindly ask to be added to the circulation list of contacts, for any and all documents, images, plans, proposals, discussion minutes, meetings, itineraries etc relating to all the development plans.

Having spoken with residents I have added the following wildlife creatures which would also be affected by any proposed development in addition to what is typed in my email from last night.

** numerous varieties of butterfly (several in my garden as I type), bees, wasps, honey bees, finches, robins (im looking at 2 now), thrushes, starlings, bats (I counted at least 10 circling my garden last night), moths, wide varieties of spiders, grouse, guinea fowl, partridges, pigeons, migrating swallows, field mice, stouts, toads, magpies, crows and many more

Also here is an additional point to my list I emailed last night.

12. The agricultural land in this area absorbs huge amounts of rain fall. Concreting over the acres of land in the proposal will place a HUGE QUANTITY of rain water into the already stressed, inadequate drainage systems and could lead to floodings and water table effects.

Mr L Inglis

For and on behalf of

ALL THE RESIDENTS FROM MIDDLETON LANE AND MIDDLETON AVENUE

I will absolutely oppose this development until the land in question is completely removed from the proposal.

I also thoroughly resent the way in which both myself and my neighbors have discovered this sly, pitiful, disgusting, and deceitful proposal. Fortunately there are some morally correct people who let us know about this, before the diggers and concrete started turning up in our local fields.

The purposefully and deceitfully hidden development proposal, yet again demonstrates the complete lack of respect and distasteful treatment the government, local government and council have for its citizens, nature, history and community and I completely deplore the process being undertaken.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: L Inglis

Representor No: PRS05785

Representation ID: REP06693 Question Ref: H7

Please accept this email as 100% OPPOSITION to the proposed house development sites 3081A & 3081B.

The irreversible damage that will be caused to this precious green belt, agriculture land cannot go ahead.

We have the term 'GREEN BELT' for a reason and the very fact this land is being considered is absolutely disgusting.

Apart from the land being GREEN BELT, I reject the proposal for the following reasons:

1. Public services are already stretched in the area and it is sometimes impossible to get doctors, dentist or other health services when needed.
 2. I cant even get my son into a local school now, so what will happen with the extra demand from new children and families?
 3. The landscape would be ruined; with OUR views COMPLETELY diminished.
 4. HISTORICALLY IMPORTANT agriculture land. Rhubarb Triangle ring any bells? Well it wont in the future if this development happens.
 5. Nature would be effected. The area sees migrating birds regularly, as well as foxes and deer. Nature already has to adapt to the commercial scarring of this planet and this development further demonstrates the lack of respect to nature - YET AGAIN.
 6. Pollution will increase both from the construction with lorry diesel fumes, chemicals, plastics, thinners, paints and other pollutants, which will be disregarded or seep into the soil. Not to mention the waste and pollution the new housed population will create forever going forward.
 7. My house value will be reduced.
 8. I work from home and the noise pollution and disruption will greatly affect me personally and professionally. NOT TO MENTION MY FAMILIES QUALITY OF LIFE. WOULD YOU WANT 373 HOUSES BUILT ON YOUR DOOR STEP? - AND I MEAN DOORSTEP.
 9. There is insufficient local infrastructure as it is before this development.
 10. This land is rural and should remain that way.
 11. The only people who will benefit from this will be the builders, banks, the council. NOT THE EXISTING LOCAL POPULATION OR ITS FUTURE GENERATIONS.
- I will absolutely oppose this development until the land in question is completely removed from the proposal.
- I also thoroughly resent the way in which both myself and my neighbors have discovered this sly, pitiful, disgusting, and deceitful proposal. Fortunately there are some morally correct people who let us know about this, before the diggers and concrete started turning up in our local fields.
- The purposefully and deceitfully hidden development proposal, yet again demonstrates the complete lack of respect and distasteful treatment the government, local government and council have for its citizens, nature, history and community and I completely deplore the process being undertaken.

Name: Alison Stewart

Representor No: PRS05786

Representation ID: REP06475 Question Ref: H1

Leeds site allocation plans: reference 3081 A & B

My husband and I write to register our strong objection to building 373 houses on GREEN BELT in Robin Hood.

We and our fellow neighbours live on Middleton Lane and Middleton Avenue, LS26, and are all astonished that building is being considered on GREEN BELT land which we believe should be preserved.

Surely you have enough brownfield sites in your land bank to consider before reclaiming what should be kept GREEN especially as this area is part of the rhubarb triangle.

This development is far too large for the infrastructure that is in place and the local schools/doctors etc in the area would not be able to cope with more children/patients. In this particular area there is more than enough new builds, even though we are a Leeds post code, Robin Hood is village right next door to us and there are at least five large housing estates in this area that have recently been built or are in the process of being built.

We do hope you will consider our objections carefully as we strongly believe GREEN BELT should remain as such!

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Adam Lunn

Representor No: PRS05787

Representation ID: REP06476 Question Ref: H1

This is to register my DISGUST and OPPOSITION to the proposed housing development sites 3081 A & 3081 B.

This is given the complete and absolute disregard for consultation and notification of the proposed plans them-self, by giving LESS THAN 3 DAYS notice to object, which I may add has more than likely being done on purpose.

NOT TO MENTION THE LIST OF OTHER REASONS I OBJECT:

The land is GREEN BELT

Public services in this area are stretched to their almost limit here, given that I have to travel to Wrenthorpe to go to the Dentist, and Oulton to the Doctors. Landscape which this private and secure street will be demolished.

Historical Agricultural land will no longer exist, (which historically makes up the Rhubarb Triangle)

By making Middleton Ave a through road would increase the traffic and thus make it unsafe environment for the numerous young children we have living in this street, thus putting them at risk of being injured.

Not to mention you as the Leeds City Council struggle to empty our bins as it is (recently in Aug 2012 - failing to empty the bins for 4 Weeks with rubbish overflowing on the street)

The character, secure and private village atmosphere which Middleton Ave & Middleton Lane has would be destroyed.

Also this would merge Middleton and Robin Hood which would again make this area lose its identity and character.

The Robin Hood, Carlton and Rothwell Primary Schools would all struggle to cope with the extra high demand for the children.

The 4 Years of Building rubble, material, diggers, machines, bricks, sand, cement, workmen, drilling, etc. that myself and my neighbours will have to endure is simply not going to happen!

Name: Steve Lunn

Representor No: PRS05788

Representation ID: REP06479 Question Ref: H1

This is to register my DISGUST and OPPOSITION to the proposed housing development sites 3081 A & 3081 B.

This is given the complete and absolute disregard for consultation and notification of the proposed plans them-self, by giving LESS THAN 3 DAYS notice to object, which I may add has more than likely being done on purpose.

NOT TO MENTION THE LIST OF OTHER REASONS I OBJECT:

The land is GREEN BELT

Public services in this area are stretched to their almost limit here, given that I have to travel to Wrenthorpe to go to the Dentist, and Oulton to the Doctors. Landscape which this private and secure street will be demolished.

Historical Agricultural land will no longer exist, (which historically makes up the Rhubarb Triangle)

By making Middleton Ave a through road would increase the traffic and thus make it unsafe environment for the numerous young children we have living in this street, thus putting them at risk of being injured.

Not to mention you as the Leeds City Council struggle to empty our bins as it is (recently in Aug 2012 - failing to empty the bins for 4 Weeks with rubbish overflowing on the street)

The character, secure and private village atmosphere which Middleton Ave & Middleton Lane has would be destroyed.

Also this would merge Middleton and Robin Hood which would again make this area lose its identity and character.

The Robin Hood, Carlton and Rothwell Primary Schools would all struggle to cope with the extra high demand for the children.

The 4 Years of Building rubble, material, diggers, machines, bricks, sand, cement, workmen, drilling, etc. that myself and my neighbours will have to endure is simply not going to happen!

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Helen Burling

Representor No: PRS05854

Representation ID: REP06569 Question Ref: H1

I am writing to express my views on the proposed housing for site 3081 A & B. I object to these houses being built for several reasons. Firstly, the site is on Green belt land which would mean valuable farming land would be lost and the rural character of the area would be altered. I believe this would have an adverse effect upon the value of my own property and also cause problems with local amenities such as schools, doctors and dentists. Unless the council also plans to open new schools in the area I believe this development would place too much strain on the existing facilities.

I have also heard that there are plans to turn our street, Middleton Avenue, into a through road - plans to which I also object strongly.

In summary, I feel that this development would have a damaging impact on the local area and unless more thought is given to how provision of local facilities for all these extra people is going to be provided then these plans should not even be considered.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration.

Name: Scott Burton

Representor No: PRS05921

Representation ID: REP06677 Question Ref: H1

The area is already over developed. There are no facilities for children or young people in the area. The road network can no longer cope. The pollution at peak traffic times is harmful to locals. The doctor's appointment waiting time is at current 7 days, with this development this will no doubt rise. The schools in the area are already overcrowded and are suffering due to this, according to Ofsted. The nice area this once was has been cashed in on by developers without regard for the locals. Green belt land is there for a reason, not to be built on because it is nice! What is the point of categorising land if this is to be abused for profit! Studies have shown there are only 100 seasons left in farmland before human waste is to be used as nutrients to supplement the land. This farmland will be lost!

Name: Joanne Burton

Representor No: PRS05924

Representation ID: REP06684 Question Ref: H7

I am sending this email in opposition to the proposal for the building of 373 house in Robin Hood (site ref:3081 A & B).

I don't think this development should take place because I feel the area does not have enough resources to cover the increase in population this would bring. Primary schools that are already full to capacity, high schools with the same problem, doctors that are that are so full you have to make an appointment weeks in advance, the same for dentists. Then there's the increase in traffic the area would have to cope with and most importantly I feel Green Belt land should stay that way. If this proposal should go through that will be another area lost to development. Eventually Robin Hood will become one complete housing estate with no green areas whatsoever. This cannot be allowed to happen!

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Sue Lunn

Representor No: PRS05925

Representation ID: REP06687 Question Ref: H7

This is to register my DISGUST and OPPOSITION to the proposed housing development sites 3081 A & 3081 B.
This is given the complete and absolute disregard for consultation and notification of the proposed plans them-self, by giving LESS THAN 3 DAYS notice to object, which I may add has more than likely being done on purpose.

NOT TO MENTION THE LIST OF OTHER REASONS I OBJECT:

The land is GREEN BELT

Public services in this area are stretched to their almost limit here, given that I have to travel to Wrenthorpe to go to the Dentist, and Oulton to the Doctors.
Landscape which this private and secure street will be demolished.

Historical Agricultural land will no longer exist, (which historically makes up the Rhubarb Triangle)

By making Middleton Ave a through road would increase the traffic and thus make it unsafe environment for the numerous young children we have living in this street, thus putting them at risk of being injured.

Not to mention you as the Leeds City Council struggle to empty our bins as it is (recently in Aug 2012 - failing to empty the bins for 4 Weeks with rubbish overflowing on the street)

The character, secure and private village atmosphere which Middleton Ave & Middleton Lane has would be destroyed.

Also this would merge Middleton and Robin Hood which would again make this area lose its identity and character.

The Robin Hood, Carlton and Rothwell Primary Schools would all struggle to cope with the extra high demand for the children.

The 4 Years of Building rubble, material, diggers, machines, bricks, sand, cement, workmen, drilling, etc. that myself and my neighbours will have to endure is simply not going to happen!

Name: Peter Wood

Representor No: PRS05926

Representation ID: REP06689 Question Ref: H7

The thought of 373 houses being built on the above numbered site, is surely ill considered. All of the current facilities and infrastructure have been stretched by the incessant building of new homes. The doctors are full, the schools are full and the A61 Wakefield Road is usually full, especially at peak times. At these times the buses are full, and it's not unusual to have to stand all the way into Leeds. Unfortunately there is no viable alternative public transport. Surely an influx of some 750+ people cannot be accommodated without a significant negative impact on the area, and its people.

Additionally, whilst I can understand the need for more housing, I fail to see why it is necessary to build on a green field site, when there are other sites available. Valuable farming land would be lost forever, and the small but important wildlife population would be denied their habitat.

Name: Andrea Pattison

Representor No: PRS05931

Representation ID: REP06696 Question Ref: H1

SITE REF: 3081 A / 3081 B

Further to my partners email below regarding the above proposed development, I would like to express that my concerns and reasons against this development going ahead are exactly the same as those included in the below email

Not one member of our street has seen any plans for the proposed development despite your colleague at the council informing us it had been advertised weekly since March 2013. I do find this hard to believe and would welcome the opportunity to view these notices.

Please accept this email as my full objection against the proposed development

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Tony X

Representor No: PRS05934

Representation ID: REP06701 Question Ref: H1

This is to register my DISGUST and OPPOSITION to the proposed housing development sites 3081 A & 3081 B.

This is given the complete and absolute disregard for consultation and notification of the proposed plans them-self, by giving LESS THAN 3 DAYS notice to object, which I may add has more than likely being done on purpose.

NOT TO MENTION THE LIST OF OTHER REASONS I OBJECT:

The land is GREEN BELT

Public services in this area are stretched to their almost limit here, given that I have to travel to Wrenthorpe to go to the Dentist, and Oulton to the Doctors. Landscape which this private and secure street will be demolished.

Historical Agricultural land will no longer exist, (which historically makes up the Rhubarb Triangle)

By making Middleton Ave a through road would increase the traffic and thus make it unsafe environment for the numerous young children we have living in this street, thus putting them at risk of being injured.

Not to mention you as the Leeds City Council struggle to empty our bins as it is (recently in Aug 2012 - failing to empty the bins for 4 Weeks with rubbish overflowing on the street)

The character, secure and private village atmosphere which Middleton Ave & Middleton Lane has would be destroyed.

Also this would merge Middleton and Robin Hood which would again make this area lose its identity and character.

The Robin Hood, Carlton and Rothwell Primary Schools would all struggle to cope with the extra high demand for the children.

The 4 Years of Building rubble, material, diggers, machines, bricks, sand, cement, workmen, drilling, etc. that myself and my neighbours will have to endure is simply not going to happen!

Name: Ian Connors

Representor No: PRS05951

Representation ID: REP06719 Question Ref: H1

Site ref: 3081 A & B

I would like to officially object to the planned building of 373 houses on green belt land in Robin Hood.

The development will be harmful to the feel of the surrounding area. Local schools and amenities could not cope with extra people. Why is green belt land being considered surely this land should be used for farming as it always has been. The wildlife would suffer significantly and I know for a fact that there are bats in the area. This is an extremely large development in an area that can't cope with it so surely common sense should be used.

Name: Sarah Connors

Representor No: PRS05952

Representation ID: REP06720 Question Ref: H1

Site ref 3081 a&b

I write in reference to the above proposed plans to build houses on this land. I live adjacent to this field and would like to have my objection officially noted. My objections are as follows:

The scale of this project would turn this rural setting into a massive housing estate with very little ground for wildlife

The development is too large and would add to the already existing problems of not enough school places, dentists and doctors

The noise pollution generated by such a massive building site not to mention dust and traffic

Loss of wildlife, we have bats, deer and foxes which are all native to this area

The land was sold as agricultural land (as it forms part of a farm) not development land

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Michelle & Craig Parker & Fleming

Representor No: PRS05954

Representation ID: REP06722 Question Ref: H1

I am writing to object to the Planning Application to build 373 houses on Green Belt land in Robin Hood (ref: 3081 A & B). I believe the consultation period is running from 3rd June – 29th July. My neighbours and I have only just heard about this after something was posted through our letterboxes yesterday, late afternoon/early evening. I wasn't aware of any planning notices nearby. This in itself is unacceptable.

I object for the following reasons:

§ The change of use of the land from a protected green space to a housing development would change the character of the area, which is supposed to be protected by the Conservation Area.

§ The excessive scale and size of this proposal would be harmful to the character of the village.

§ The sheer volume of houses on this site would be unsustainable, existing facilities could not cope with the extra demand.

§ The site is on Green Belt land which should be preserved. Other sites including Brownfield in particular should be considered first.

§ Loss of farming land.

§ The land lies in the centre of the famous Rhubarb Triangle.

§ The development is too large and would generate more children than the local schools can cope with. Carlton and Robin Hood Primary Schools and Rodillian High School are already at capacity and do not have spare places.

§ Insufficient infrastructure in neighbouring villages to cope with the development.

§ The development is in a rural location and is not sustainable.

§ Extensive housing here would erode the separation between Robin Hood and Middleton, an important role of the Green Belt.

§ The plan takes no account of the effect on traffic, causing severe strain on the roads with additional traffic congestion on an already busy main route.

§ There are no train stations nearby and buses are already very full at peak times. I have had to stand up on the bus on many occasions.

§ There will be an added danger to pedestrians, cyclists and dog walkers in the area. The housing development will only be accessible from a main road, which also makes driving in and out difficult and dangerous for cars.

§ The current infrastructure capacity of the local area regarding General Practitioners, Dentists, roads and sewers has not been adequately considered. A development of 373 housing units will place additional strain on local amenities and this has not been considered.

Name: Allison Hill

Representor No: PRS05955

Representation ID: REP06723 Question Ref: H1

Site Reference 3081A & B

I would like to submit this email as a formal request for the above development not to be given the go ahead.

The impact on the local area is huge and local facilities would not be able to cope with the building of a further 373 houses.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Karen Renshaw

Representor No: PRS06048

Representation ID: REP06876 Question Ref: H1

Sites 3081A, 3085 & 3445A - Green to Red

I wish to make some formal objections to the proposals set out in the documents regarding the site allocation plans.

- Church Farm , WF3 3SA – 1261 Proposal to build 144 houses
- Hope Farm - 3081 Part A & B Proposal to build 279 properties
- The Grange -3085 Proposal to build 234 homes
- Leadwell Lane - 3445A Proposed 60 properties

The above sites are within the Rothwell side of Ardsley & Robin Hood. All the schools within this area are already full to their capacity and some are already being extended. The infrastructure has already been over accommodating and the amenities within this region of the Ward are insufficient to facilitate current residents. Due to recent development work the roads have become busier and safety elements have had to be implemented. It is a sad situation when local residents cannot attend their local schools and yet the transport cannot accommodate the alternatives given. The green space is a key feature, that which is left and its an area valued by all within this community.

The increase in traffic, noise , pollution as well as the damage to our environment, removing historical elements and eliminating the rhubarb triangle would be detrimental to health and well- being of local residents.This would impact on our young children who already struggle to get appointments at our local GP's

I strongly oppose the above proposals and hope that these aspects, along with those of local residents who managed to be informed of this process, will be considered before any decisions are made.

Name: R Woodhead

Representor No: PRS06057

Representation ID: REP06902 Question Ref: H1

I write with grave concern at the proposed building of 373 houses on Green Belt land near to my home in [x]. (Site reference number 3081 A &B).

There is enough traffic using the A61 as it is and trying to join the A61 from Middleton Lane is at times horrendous ,and can on occasions take upwards of up to 5 minutes to get onto the main road. Some of my neighbours have young children and they are struggling to register their children at the local schools as it is,without having an increase in having more children wanting school places. I fear this proposal will also impact on Doctors and Dentist surgeries etc. We appear to be losing the rural element to the area which would restrict dog walkers , family walks etc. As a resident near this proposed site i strongly object to permission being granted to build these houses. I also would like to register a complaint regarding the state of Middleton Lane. The lane is riddled with pot holes and the hedgerows are in desparated need of cutting back. On driving up or down the lane ,pedestrians are having to stand into the hedges ,some containing nettles, broken glass and other litter until cars pass, . Some of the brambles etc scratch the cars due to to the hedges being so overgrown. Residents on Middleton Avenue are struggling to park their cars and god help us if we need to get emergency vehicles to the end of the street. This wouldnt have been a problem a few years ago, until someone at the council decided to widen both footpaths on the street. They were widened by at least 4feet overall, thus narrowing the width of the road. Please dont inflict anymore grief for the residents in this area, and refuse permission for the 373 houses to be built.

Name: Debra Ranby

Representor No: PRS06167

Representation ID: REP07058 Question Ref: H1

Sites 3081A and 3081B

Where are the prosped sites for these new development? Building should not be allowed on green belt land, this is a rural area.

Representation ID: REP07058 Question Ref: H1

Sites 3081A and 3081B

Schools, Doctors, Dentists etc are already stretched to capacity. New developments mean new junctions have to be made onto the main roads. These roads are more than busy enough already.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Robert Marshall

Representor No: PRS06180

Representation ID: REP07068 Question Ref: H1

I have recently found out that a local greenfield site has received planning permission to build 373 new houses (site reference 3081 A&B) and I would like to register a formal objection. The land that has been allocated is currently farming land and as such should be seen as greenbelt. Where I live in Rothwell Haigh there is very little separation of areas with Lofthouse/Robin Hood being merged and only the M1 link road separating Robin Hood/Rothwell Haigh from Middleton/Belle Isle. The area around the Jawbones is being swallowed up by large industrial units and what is a small greenbelt is under threat of disappearing and once it has gone it there will be no getting it back. The local schools already struggle to cope with the volume of children and as a result a further influx of children will make demand for the local schools soar and will cause children into schools (both primary and secondary) in the Middleton/ Belle Isle areas. There are brownfield sites that must be more suitable to sustain large house building projects before we start destroying a picturesque and valuable part of our community. Once the easy option of desirable areas being built on, the other greenfield sites surrounding the historic Rhubarb Triangle will become an easy target and the LS26 area of Leeds will just become a suburb of Leeds/Wakefield. Thank you for your time with this matter.

Name: Diane Griffiths

Representor No: PRS06226

Representation ID: REP07133 Question Ref: H1

3081A Hope Farm - Green to Red

I am e-mailing you in reference to 373 houses being built on green belt land in Robin Hood. Which I believe should not go ahead.

Only too often is our country side being swallowed up by housing, before long there will be no beautiful country side left to enjoy, we will also have to rely more on food being imported than growing our own.

Each time another country joins the EU we get immigrants coming into the country for a better way of life, our country is too small to accommodate them it is already over crowded and there is not enough social housing for the people who already live in this country.

You can't get appointments at the doctors, sometimes you have to wait weeks to see a doctor or call the surgery each morning to see if they have got any emergency appointment left, which will get worse if the build goes ahead, not to mention the hospitals and schools which are at a capacity now. Its near impossible to get a NHS dentist and many people can not afford to pay for private treatment.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Carol Kellett

Representor No: PRS06229

Representation ID: REP07137 Question Ref: H1

3081a
3081b - Hope Farm Robin Hood/Wakefield Road Rothwell LS26

I am strongly apposed to any development on this Green Belt Area after it coming to my attention that there is a Planning Application for some 373 houses to be built. As I walk down that main road now there is excessive traffic and noise, cars and mainly lorries go far faster than the speed limit, it is a noisy dirty road that doesn't need any extra traffic- if every householder owns a car on the new estate then that is at least 300+ cars coming in and out of that estate morning and evening. If the access road was to be built on Sharp Lane then again, there is excessive traffic and noise already, that is why our local Councillors campaigned for Traffic Lights at the Junction with Wakefield Road due to all the cars and lorries. On a morning the traffic is backing up Sharp Lane in the rush hour and that is before the extra houses have been built. Robin Hood / Rothwell Haigh is semi rural, this will no longer be the case, we will be a cluster of houses in between a motorway and a new and ugly housing estate. I feel that if we carry on building, in 20 - 30 years time there will be few green areas, just smog, pollution and 3 bedroom detached housing estates that all look the same.

There is already a problem with youths coming through the motorway tunnel from Middleton LS10 to Middleton Lane/Avenue LS26 to commit petty crimes i.e shed break ins- so the extra new houses will be like a honey pot to them.

I could not get my son in to Robin Hood Primary School 3 years ago as it is over subscribed, as are the local doctors- where will all these extra people find the facilities that are needed? Why oh why do we need to build more houses when there are already an abundance of properties laying empty, that families could move in to once modernised. To summarise it would be a blot on the landscape- it is a lovely area full of wild life and picturesque....so why change it ??

Name: Nicola Parker

Representor No: PRS06296

Representation ID: REP07222 Question Ref: H1

Dear Sir or Madam.

I have received notice today of plans to build 373 houses on a green belt area in Robin Hood Wakefield, site reference 3081 A&B.

I have lived at [x] for nearly 15 years and the views from my garden were the main reason I bought the house.

I have ten year old twin girls and we have so many amazing memories of our time here with them playing in the garden. Hearing that these houses may be built is an awful thought.

I wonder if anyone has considered what effect this will have on our local schools as I know that Rodillion and Rothwell Primary are already at capacity and have no spare places.

Getting an appointment with my GP or Dentist is already very difficult, think of the strain it would put on them to have even more patients.

I'm proud to say I live in Rothwell and in particular on Angel Row as the houses are quaint and full of character, however if this proposal goes ahead I fear that my home and it's surroundings will lose this, also we're in the centre of the famous Rhubarb Triangle.

All this aside, I can't understand why anyone is being allowed to build on Green Belt land which should be preserved, this obviously stands for nothing. What about the people that have bought their houses recently knowing that the surrounding area is Green Belt only to be told that it means nothing!!

Why can't other sites be considered first, Brownfield in particular?

What about the loss of farming land?

I'll finish off by saying how upset I am that the building of these houses would erode the separation between us and Middleton, very upset.

Please reconsider your decisions.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H1

3445A - Agree Green - see full submitted representation for details

This land is possibly appropriate for development and is well connected to the urban area and would consolidate existing housing. However the frontage of the site is considered not be extensive and physical access might be a problem, particularly in the context of a local dwelling which is bounded by the site. Sight lines on the carriageway could also be a problem

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H1

3081A

Name: Sue Kershaw

Representor No: PRS06351

Representation ID: REP05722 Question Ref: H1

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

I write with regard to the above Planning Application and would like to raise objections to the building of 373 private dwellings on this Green Belt land.

· The land is Green Belt, which should be preserved for the enjoyment of us now and future generations

· Farming land would be lost and this site is in the middle of the famous Rhubarb Triangle

· The development would have a massive impact on our local schools (as well as the safety of our children) which are already filled to capacity

· Robin Hood is a village with character, this would be lost

· The sheer volume of houses on this site would be unsustainable, existing facilities would not be able to cope with the extra demand

· Insufficient infrastructure in neighbouring villages to cope with the development

· This would have a dramatic impact on local services such as doctors and dentists

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Kristine Steele

Representor No: PRS06372

Representation ID: REP07382 Question Ref: H1

Objecting to 3085 & 3081A

I wish to write to you to express my concerns on the Site Allocation Plan - Issues and Options information. Firstly I must say that on Monday 21st July if it had not been by chance that a person came along on Greenmoor Avenue and gave my husband the information about the future consultation for our area I would not have known anything about this Plan. I do not read the Yorkshire Evening Post, or call at the One Stop Centres but I do visit the Rothwell library and on Tuesday 22nd July I did find a small poster on the noticeboard at the back of the Douglas Barlow room. It was a poster that was easily missed and retrospect it would have been useful to have had a meeting in Lofthouse itself.

At our local PACT meeting on the evening of Monday 21st July two Leeds Councillors came and we did get the information then, but the majority of the local people at the PACT meeting said that they also had not known anything about the meetings or the consultation itself. I believe that there are still many people in the Lofthouse area who may not know about this and would have liked to have had the opportunity to express their opinions. There has only been a week to make a response in respect of the two huge plots of land that is being considered for allocation for housing, which is the Leeds and Wakefield Road site at Lofthouse (3085) and the Hope Farm site (3081A) Wakefield Road, Rothwell. I am annoyed there may be some people in the local communities who have not been properly informed of this development plan and this information should have been mailed to local homes directly who live in the areas of these sites. I do understand that Leeds City Council has a statutory duty to advertise what is happening but I am afraid the information does not always reach everybody. Everyone in the community has an equal right to be involved in making comments about future developments that may affect them. If in the future you advertise any meetings please would you kindly put details in the Wakefield Express as well as more residents in this area are likely to see it.

The land on the Leeds and Wakefield Road (3085) and bordered by Jumbles Lane and Cemetery Lane has been a field that has been used for agriculture for a very long time and would be a huge loss of farming land. I believe that this land should be preserved as it is and other brownfield sites should be considered first. The quantity of houses to be considered on both sites (3085) and (3081A) will be overbearing and is unbelievable in this area as this development would have insufficient infrastructure in the area to support it and the surrounding villages would be unable to cope with school places. Carlton Primary School, Robin Hood School and Rodillian Secondary School are at capacity and do not have spare places. There would also be insufficient infrastructure also for health facilities and recreation.

The access to the Lofthouse site(3085) is a concern and would also add extra traffic to the busy A61 especially at peak times. This site also has two crossroads one major and one minor that lie on its outer perimeter. How will residents access this site and will the development result in an increase of traffic on minor village roads too. This site is not flat as it slopes from the property next door down to Jumbles Lane and has had problems with flooding from heavy rainfall collecting at the crossroads near to Cemetery Lane. To cover this land with housing and roads will add extra rainfall water flowing down to this junction as the land would not be able to absorb it.

Previous housing developments on the A61 on the Leeds and Wakefield Road has been mostly land that lies further back from the main road and does not have a huge frontage onto the main A61 road. This housing would be more visible from the main and side roads so would be viewed on three sides and to all the surrounding residents. The site would not be in keeping with the surrounding housing and would also be overbearing where it meets an agricultural field below it on Cemetery Lane.

Are the two sites (3085) and 3081A) to be developed at the same time or are they to be staggered?

When you walk down Cemetery Lane down to Carlton or visa versa you feel as if you are walking from one village to another, with open fields, wide views, and seeing the effect of the seasons on the land. The Lofthouse site lies in the centre of the world famous Rhubarb Triangle, a rural location that adds to the rural image when visitors come to see the Rhubarb fields and view the forced rhubarb growing in the forcing sheds. The surrounding fields of crops growing is what needs to be seen not a huge field covered with boxy houses. I feel that the development will be harmful to the character of the area as the land sits in an area that still has a rural feel and if the land is on Green Belt then this should be kept as such.

I would support smaller developments of 30-35 houses, but not huge housing developments as they are not sustainable as the infrastructure is only coping at the moment. Another idea I might support for the Lofthouse site is that if it was appropriate or if there was a need for it from the community, it would be for Lofthouse to have its own Junior and Infants School and possibly a Community Centre. If there is a need for school places this would help alleviate the lack of places in this area and would give Lofthouse more of its own identity whereby the children would go to their own school in their own area. All the schools in the area are very good schools. This use of the land for a school would not be as intrusive or unattractive as

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: Kristine Steele

Representor No: PRS06372

234 modern boxy houses looking very much the same.

If both of the two sites are to be considered for housing development with a combination of 513 houses being built I feel that the community will be frustrated that the rural feel of our area will be hugely eroded and an urbanisation will be imposed on it that the local community doesn't want.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07466 Question Ref: H1

3081 Agree Green - see submitted representation for full details

It is our view is that opportunities exist to achieve sustainable development at land at Hope Farm and we welcome the authority's favourable assessment of the site.

3.2.37 We note that the site has been split and that the most westerly 8ha of the site (3081B – falling within the Inner Market Character Area) has been rejected for the reason that it is “not well related to the urban area and no existing defensible boundary. Development would constitute urban sprawl”. Notwithstanding our comments above and in regard to the delineation of Market Character Areas (Section 4), our proposals provide a comprehensive framework for the whole of site 3081 to achieve development needs in a sustainable way which would be least damaging to the purposes and integrity of the Green Belt, and which promote opportunities to enhance the landscape character of the motorway corridor.

3.2.38 As demonstrated above and in the accompanying Vision Document, the site is not subject to any technical or environmental constraints that would prevent it from coming forward and is achievable without significant adverse environmental impacts (NPPF, para 152). Its allocation would be in conformity with the spatial development strategy in the Core Strategy and would ensure the long term sustainable growth of Robin Hood/Lofthouse.

3.2.39 Land at Hope Farm should continue to be considered as a preferred site for sustainable growth. We reserve the right to submit supplementary evidence as necessary to further substantiate the Council's assessment that land at Hope Farm represents a site with the greatest potential to be allocated for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07891 Question Ref: H1

3081A
Pegasus strongly support the identification of site 3081A as a green site representing land most suitable site to consider allocating for future housing development in the Outer South Market Character Area. Site 3081 should be included wholly within a single market character area. The entirety of the site is physically and visually linked to Robin Hood so should be considered within the relevant housing character area of this settlement.

Site Characteristics

The total site area of land at Hope Farm is 30 hectares (75 acres). This includes land forming a 'buffer' area along the motorway corridor outside the extent of the proposed residential development area (see submitted Vision Document). The predominate use of the site is for arable crop growing. Hope Farm farmhouse and various redundant farm buildings are located to the immediate west of Middleton Avenue, accessed from Wakefield Road. The land is bounded by the M1/M621 corridor to the west, Sharp Lane to the south and the A61 Wakefield Road to the east. To the north are residential properties and recreational land off Middleton Lane. North west of the site extending northwards is further arable land associated with Hope Farm (see Figure 1). The character of the area is defined by the residential uses which surround the site to three sides. The motorway corridor and associated infrastructure dominates the landscape to the west.

Unrestricted Sprawl

- Would the development of the site lead to ribbon development? – No. The development of the site would not be 'ribboned' – it would not radiate away from the settlement in a lineal or sprawling manner. The residential area at Glebe Crescent/Middleton Avenue to the north and the development at Jarvis Walk to the south protrude westwards encroaching towards the motorway corridor. Development on the site would infill the gap between this existing built form.
- Would the development of the site result in isolated development not connected to existing boundaries? - No. Land at Hope Farm is contained on three sides by built form. The urban edge setting; the dominance of and proximity to the motorway corridor; the influence of human activity, and the surrounding road network all contribute to the site being contained.
- Is the site well connected to the built up area? – Yes. Land at Hope Farm is well related and linked to Robin Hood. Given the particular characteristics of the site and its containment the potential for sprawling form into open countryside is considered to be low.
- Would development of the site effectively round off the settlement pattern? - Yes. Development on the site would infill the gap between the existing built form to the north and south.
- Do natural or physical features provide an existing barrier between the existing the urban area of Robin Hood and undeveloped land? - No. There are no strong physical boundaries between the urban edge and the site. It has long stretches of road frontage to both Wakefield Road and Sharp Lane thus it is easily accessible and visible from urban area of Robin Hood.
- Summary - We strongly support the authority's assessment that the site has low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl.

Merging of Settlements

- Would development lead to physical connection of settlements? - No. The development of the site would not lead to the merger of Robin Hood with another settlement. The western extent of the urban edge of Robin Hood is presently defined by development at Middleton Avenue and Jarvis Walk and also by the farm complex of Hope Farm. Development would better incorporate these outlying residential areas, effectively 'rounding off' the settlement pattern in the north west of the settlement.
- Do natural / physical features provide a good existing barrier to contain development? Yes. The M1/M621 corridor forms a strong, permanent, defensible barrier to enclose development at land at Hope Farm. The Farm complex and Middleton Avenue define the extent of built form to the north and north west. Significant opportunities for landscape enhancement to the motorway corridor exist to further define this barrier.
- Summary - The development of the site will not result in the merging of Robin Hood with another settlement. The site also benefits from readily recognisable and permanent physical boundaries that define the western extent of the site. It is therefore our view that the development of the site will not lead to coalescence.

Countryside encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the existing urban area and the site? – No. There are no strong physical boundaries between the urban edge and the site. It has long stretches of road frontage to both Wakefield Road and Sharp Lane with minimal boundary treatments.
- Does the site provide access to the countryside? - No. There are no public rights of way through the site. A public bridleway exists along the northern boundary providing access between Robin Hood and Belle Isle via a motorway underpass. Opportunities exist to improve connectivity between the existing urban area of Robin Hood to areas of greenspace within the site. The site can also serve to improve pedestrian and cycle links to the existing Strategic Green Infrastructure Network beyond the motorway to the west by providing safe and legible routes to the designated bridleway. Land at Hope Farm is not a designated park or greenspace.
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas? – No.
- Does the site include protected woodlands/trees/hedgerow or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover? – No.
- Does the site include Grade 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land? – Yes.
- Does the site contain buildings? - Yes. The site contains the farmhouse at Hope Farm and a variety of redundant farm buildings. In addition to these buildings the site contains a double row of high voltage electricity pylons running north to south close to the western boundary of the site following the M1 corridor.
- Are these in agricultural use? - Yes. A residential unit is also present on the site (Hope Farmhouse)
- Summary - The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside in this part of the district from encroachment.

Historic Character

- Is the site adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historic feature? If yes, could development preserve the character of this asset? - No. There are no designated heritage assets within the site. The nearest listed building is the Clock Tower at St George's Hospital approximately 1km away. The nearest Conservation Area is at Rothwell approximately 1.5km to the east.

Overall green belt Conclusions

The selective Green Belt review in the Leeds district is justified by exceptional circumstances to meet an overriding need for housing development. Paragraph 84 of the NPPF states that authorities should take into account the need to promote sustainable patterns of development when reviewing Green Belt boundaries. The Green Belt Assessment for land at Hope Farm demonstrates that the site can make a significant contribution to meeting the development land supply needs in a sustainable way which would be least damaging to the purposes and integrity of

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

the Green Belt.

Access, Highways & Accessibility

The relationship of the site with the urban area of Robin Hood will allow people to undertake day-to-day activities by sustainable modes of travel. A range of bus services are readily accessible from the immediate road network surrounding the site. Service 110, for example, stops on Wakefield Road on the site boundary with buses every 10 minutes getting into Leeds within a 15 minute journey time.

A range of local facilities are available within walking and cycling distance in Robin Hood. These include a primary school, secondary school, convenience shop, Post Office, pharmacy, doctors, Public Houses, food takeaways, petrol filling station and hairdressers. A wider range of services are also available at nearby Rothwell and Belle Isle/Middleton. The site is also of an appropriate scale and location to offer the opportunity for ancillary non-residential uses for which there may be a local need to improve social sustainability. Such opportunities can be explored further through the advancement of the Plan process. We support the access ranking in the Site Assessment. Robin Hood is a settlement strategically placed on the highway network. Utilising the site's existing connections to the strategic highway network and to the main urban area we can create new infrastructure connections to provide appropriate, permeable and safe access into the site for private cars and for cyclists and pedestrians. This will include two priority junctions: one from the A61 Wakefield Road; and one from Sharp Lane. The external network capacity effects have been assessed through feasibility work. No major transport infrastructure is required. The site will provide for improvements to the off-site highway network, and to pedestrian, cycle and public transport provision in compliance with the Authority's requirements. We do not share the Highway Agency's view that it is "likely to require significant physical mitigation."

Biodiversity

The site does not comprise a statutory or non-statutory designated ecological site. It has low overall ecological value due to the intensive arable use.

Land at Hope Farm – Drainage & Utilities

The site is located within Flood Zone 1. As such there are no reasonably available sites for residential development with a lower probability of flooding than land at Hope Farm (NPPF, para 101). Flood risk and drainage matters have been assessed through feasibility work. The development of land at Hope Farm will avoid increased vulnerability to flood risk impacts of climate change. The site is capable of supporting a robust sustainable urban drainage system.

Built Heritage

There are no designated heritage assets within the site. The nearest listed building is the Clock Tower at St George's Hospital approximately 1km away. The nearest Conservation Area is at Rothwell approximately 1.5km to the east.

Summary

It is our view is that opportunities exist to achieve sustainable development at land at Hope Farm and we welcome the authority's favourable assessment of the site. We note that the site has been split and that the most westerly 8ha of the site (3081B – falling within the Inner Market Character Area) has been rejected for the reason that it is "not well related to the urban area and no existing defensible boundary. Development would constitute urban sprawl". Notwithstanding our comments above and in regard to the delineation of Market Character Areas (Section 4), our proposals provide a comprehensive framework for the whole of site 3081 to achieve development needs in a sustainable way which would be least damaging to the purposes and integrity of the Green Belt, and which promote opportunities to enhance the landscape character of the motorway corridor.

As demonstrated above and in the accompanying Vision Document [see representation], the site is not subject to any technical or environmental constraints that would prevent it from coming forward and is achievable without significant adverse environmental impacts (NPPF, para 152). Its allocation would be in conformity with the spatial development strategy in the Core Strategy and would ensure the long term sustainable growth of Robin Hood/Lofthouse.

Representation ID: REP07891 Question Ref: H11

3081A

3081B

The NPPF is clear that authorities must identify a supply of specific deliverable sites to provide a five year supply (plus buffer) against their housing requirements, and identify a supply of specific, developable sites for growth for years 6-10 and, where possible, years 11-15. The site will make a valuable contribution with the delivery of approximately 400 dwellings to meet the District's quantitative housing requirements as well as meeting the qualitative need to provide family and affordable housing within the area. It has been demonstrated that land at Hope Farm (site 3081) offers a suitable location for growth. The Concept Plan for the site illustrates how development could be delivered taking into consideration the site conditions. The site is owned by a single landowner and there is an intention to develop the site. There are thus no legal or ownership constraints such as multiple landowners, ransom strips or tenancies. The site is readily available. The landowner will continue agricultural production on the remaining northern portion of Hope Farm which is not proposed for allocation (see Figure 1). A range of national and local housebuilders have expressed considerable interest in progressing the site sufficient to support delivery of around 400 homes, associated infrastructure and greenspace. There is the potential to commence development on the site in the short term.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3081A

Housing

Robin Hood West

Name: R Knowles

Representor No: PRS06663

Representation ID: REP07887 Question Ref: H1

Site 3081A — Disagree should be amber - see submitted representation for full details

This site abuts the M1 motorway and on that basis it is not considered that the fullness of the site can be delivered primarily to noise issues. This designation should be reduced in half in order to protect the future amenity of occupiers.

Furthermore, the allocation of this site would in our opinion have an unacceptable impact upon the Green Belt as it would push development in an out of sync nature with existing built form.

It is our opinion that this site should be reduced significantly and therefore should only deliver 100 of the 279 dwellings identified.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3084

Housing

Cemetery Lane, Lofthouse

Name: Janet Dobson

Representor No: PRS03431

Representation ID: REP01994 Question Ref: H3

3084No not suitable for any housing development

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H7

3084 Cemetery Lane, Lofthouse – I support the designation of this site as Red for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

Name: Carlton Neighbourhood Association

Representor No: PRS06375

Representation ID: REP07379 Question Ref: H7

3084 - Agree should be red - see submitted representation for full details.

This site is Green Belt land and its development would represent significant sprawl in relation to the size of the settlement. It also does not connect to existing dwellings.

The size of the development upon this site is also disproportionate in relation to the existing settlement.

The CVRA considers this site inappropriate for development

Name: Justin Coley

Representor No: PRS06448

Representation ID: REP07524 Question Ref: H7

Site 3084 Cemetery Lane, Lofthouse

This site is Green Belt land and its development would represent significant sprawl in relation to the size of the settlement. It also does not connect to existing dwellings.

The size of the development upon this site is also disproportionate in relation to the existing settlement.

The CVRA considers this site inappropriate for development.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Hemshall

Representor No: PRS00203

Representation ID: REP02137 Question Ref: H1

3085 - Re the proposed site, Leeds Rd, Jumbles Lane, Cemetery Lane, for housing. We object most strongly to the proposed plan. The commodity most short of in England is good agricultural land. This land can never be replaced, once built on it can never be replaced, lost forever! There are a lot of unused sites in the Leeds area, which could be developed, empty shops, warehouses, now closed, Pontefract Lane Market, a site near A63 on way to Temple Newsam. Brownfield sites galore. At the moment this field has a beautiful crop of Barley growing, not to be seen again if some people have their way.
DISGUSTED

Name: Maria Woodward

Representor No: PRS00291

Representation ID: REP05394 Question Ref: H1

Objection to green

It has only just come to our notice (via a letter through the door last night) that there is a proposal to build on green belt land opposite my home on Leeds Road Lofthouse, I would like to know why this is the first we have been made aware of this we have had no previous letters from Leeds Planning Department with regards to this because if we have we would have attended the drop-in events, incidentally none of my neighbours have been aware of these meetings either so they must have been very hush hush.

I would like to strongly object to this planning going ahead, this is the famous Rhubarb Triangle we are talking about here, Lofthouse over the years has been built up and built up to such an extent we are overpopulated as a village, there are not enough school places, all schools in the area are over-subscribed, the doctors surgeries are at bursting point giving poor patient care, not forgetting the amount of traffic which is going to be created on an already accident spot area of the A61. In the middle of this green belt land is a copse which is untouched, it is packed with wildlife, birds, foxes, badgers, pheasants, birds etc, have the conservationist department been made aware of these plans. Why do people feel the need to spoil what lovely countryside we have left with ugly developments of packed in houses.

My husband and myself cannot attend the meeting which is the last one to be organised as we are attending a wedding, so these are our views - DEFINITELY NO TO ANY BUILDING ON THE BEAUTIFUL RHUBARB TRIANGLE GREENBELT LAND.

[x].

Representation ID: REP02232 Question Ref: H1

3085 - Proposed Development of Green Belt Land
Leeds Road, Lofthouse

I have already sent an email, to your email address, also to our three local Councillors stating our objection to any building whatsoever on this piece of land, Lofthouse over the years I have lived here (30yrs) has been built up so much it no longer resembles the lovely village feel it used to have.

This piece of land is part of the famous Rhubarb Triangle, when this is built on the Rhubarb Triangle will not exist, walkers, families for years have enjoyed this land and now the plan is to put up 234 ugly crammed in houses, the schools in this area are already oversubscribed, the doctors surgeries are bursting leading to poor patient care, not forgetting the copse in the middle of this land which is a home to a host of wildlife, I'm sure the conservationist department do not know of this. The traffic alone it will create will be horrendous for the busy A61, already an accident spot.

I want to know why none of the residents it affects the most were never informed of the so-called drop-in meetings which had been arranged since 18th June, why did none of us receive letters from the planning department, or LCC, the first I heard of this was when a neighbour gave me a typed sheet informing residents of this catastrophe on our doorsteps, it seems to have been kept very hush, hush maybe that was the intention so none of us would be able to reply in time.
Well myself and my family wish to strongly oppose this development

Name: Barry Woodward

Representor No: PRS00542

Representation ID: REP02492 Question Ref: H1

3085 -

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: C Jaques

Representor No: PRS00551

Representation ID: REP02502 Question Ref: H1

3085 – Finally Carlton Lane has a severe problem of park and ride users of 110 bus service is causing congestion and chemist (necessary) and new printing business also adding to problems and I feel this development is ill advised for a rural area.

Representation ID: REP02502 Question Ref: H1

3085 – Area is adjacent to Green Lane, Carlton Lane and Cemetery Lane which is already experiencing very heavy traffic, all local schools are at capacity with no spare places and I feel it would not support any increase in population.

Representation ID: REP02502 Question Ref: H1

3085 – The site is green belt land designated 'not to be built on' and is also food production area and part of the 'rhubarb triangle' and therefore should be carefully preserved. Surely there a 'brown' areas in Leeds can be used first.

Name: Melvyn Plenderleith

Representor No: PRS00555

Representation ID: REP02506 Question Ref: H1

3085 – Will the development include more facilities? The local schools are jam packed and the local surgery has already 10,000+ patients on its books. Are developers interested only in housing and not the important adds on with such a vast enlargement of the population and removal of land.

Representation ID: REP02506 Question Ref: H1

3085 – The region is by now a well known tourist area, the so called Rhubarb Triangle. This has a benefit to the local economy. The walk around Cemetery Lane, Green Lane is a particular favourite for People seeking a simple exercise walk. More houses = less agricultural land = less work for farmers.

Representation ID: REP02506 Question Ref: H1

3085 – In an already overcrowded area, with open spaces at a premium, any further development on the projected site, will further diminish the open views of the area. The roads around the area, especially the A61 Wakefield – Leeds Road are exceptionally busy with vehicular traffic often breaking the speed limit. It is easy to see the infrastructure cannot cope at this time.

Name: David Lockwood

Representor No: PRS00696

Representation ID: REP02692 Question Ref: H1

3085 - This is a valued rural amenity space for recreation, dog walking and cycling etc. at the same time it helps to keep the settlements of Lofthouse, Robin Hood and Carlton separate, preventing urban sprawl. This is excellent agricultural land that is a major part of the Ruhbarb Triangle, renowned world wide for growing such a unique product. This site is part of the green belt and should be protected.

Representation ID: REP02692 Question Ref: H1

3085 - It is doubtful whether existing educational (schools) and health facilities can meet the demands from this site on top of the already developing sites in Robin Hood, Carlton and Lofthouse area. The schools at Carlton, Robin Hood and Rodillion are already full. This could mean long journeys for young children (possibly to schools outside the Leeds MDC area). Similar long journeys might be needed for older people to visit GPs etc.

Representation ID: REP02692 Question Ref: H1

3085 - The site itself has problems, i.e. a former 'Bell Mine' that burned out many years ago is reported to be where there is a copse of trees on the sites.

The south east corner of the site acts as a flood plain at times of heavy rain when water drains into the junction of Carlton Lane, Green Lane and Cemetery Lane. If this flood plain is developed for housing they could be flood or houses along Green Lane would be flooded. Some remedial work has recently been done in this area, but has yet to be put to test.

Representation ID: REP02692 Question Ref: H1

3085 - The infrastructure in and around this site is inadequate for a scheme of this scale. Adding 234 new houses to the area will increase traffic on already overstretched road networks and only aggravate the problem (i.e. approximately 400 extra vehicles would quickly result from this scheme). How will access to the site be made. Major road works will be needed if access is from any of the existing roads – A61 / Green Lane / Carlton Lane.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Nicholas Card

Representor No: PRS00713

Representation ID: REP02716 Question Ref: H1

3085 - I was astounded to hear that Leeds CC had plans to build 234 houses on the land outlined. At first I thought it was a joke. I have lived in this area for 34 years. This is green belt land in what is realistically an area of outstanding beauty. How can a council which purports itself to "want to make sure that we have a positive impact on the environment" and be "ecologically friendly" with regards to recycling etc. even consider this? When steps are being taken by politicians and welfare groups in general to encouraging children to interconnect and engage with the country side what sort of message does this send out to the pupils of Carlton, Robin Hood and Rodillian schools, the classrooms of which of course we all know are seriously overloaded now. For the first time in my memory we can now wake up to see deer feeding at dawn. At dusk we see bats, which live in the trees in the coppice, fly over as they feed on insects which come off the crops in the fields in question. Furthermore we now have a wonderful farm shop in Carlton village which many of us patronize. I understand the owners plan further expansion in order to make it more children and family friendly. We walk down to the farm shop with our grandchild on a regular basis right past the fields in question in order to buy some provisions on a regular basis and as we do we admire and appreciate our local country side. Farm shop with no farm land? Because this application could of course be the thin end of the wedge.

Another rather important point I would like to make, in case it has been overlooked] is that it is a well known fact that intensive building has exacerbated flooding problem all over the country causing misery and expense to millions including local authorities. Infrastructures not capable of coping with flash flooding as a result of climate change. Not 25 yards away from the nearest point to the proposed site we have had serious flooding problems over the years and remedial works have been ongoing for the last 6 months causing more disruption. I don't think that covering the neighbouring farm land with houses and roads would bode well. You can build as many drains as you want but the water has to go somewhere.

Traffic obviously would be another problem. As busy as the roads already are it is now it would only compromise safety for elderly residents [of whom there are many] and children, many of whom enjoy the walks. Pollution is another obvious concern.

The infrastructure and housing strains on most cities are well known but by passing applications such as this is merely putting sticking plasters over the issues. Why cannot LCC be pioneers of change and look at other possible solutions rather than following trends such as build, build, build? I suppose that in the end money may talk but I intend to fight this as much as I can. Bearing in mind LCC's advertised philosophy on enhancing and/or protecting constituent's quality of life the whole proposition smacks of hypocrisy.

I would appreciate it if you would take my and my wife's points on board on what is a seriously contentious issue.

Representation ID: REP05377 Question Ref: H1

Objection to green

I was astounded to hear that Leeds CC had plans to build 234 houses on the land outlined. At first I thought it was a joke. I have lived in this area for 34 years. This is green belt land in what is realistically an area of outstanding beauty. How can a council which purports itself to "want to make sure that we have a positive impact on the environment" and be "ecologically friendly" with regards to recycling etc. even consider this? When steps are being taken by politicians and welfare groups in general to encouraging children to interconnect and engage with the country side what sort of message does this send out to the pupils of Carlton, Robin Hood and Rodillian schools, the classrooms of which of course we all know are seriously overloaded now. For the first time in my memory we can now wake up to see deer feeding at dawn. At dusk we see bats, which live in the trees in the coppice, fly over as they feed on insects which come off the crops in the fields in question. Furthermore we now have a wonderful farm shop in Carlton village which many of us patronize. I understand the owners plan further expansion in order to make it more children and family friendly. We walk down to the farm shop with our grandchild on a regular basis right past the fields in question in order to buy some provisions on a regular basis and as we do we admire and appreciate our local country side. Farm shop with no farm land? Because this application could of course be the thin end of the wedge.

Another rather important point I would like to make, [in case it has been overlooked] is that it is a well known fact that intensive building has exacerbated flooding problem all over the country causing misery and expense to millions including local authorities. Infrastructures not capable of coping with flash flooding as a result of climate change. Not 25 yards away from the nearest point to the proposed site we have had serious flooding problems over the years and remedial works have been ongoing for the last 6 months causing more disruption. I don't think that covering the neighbouring farm land with houses and roads would bode well. You can build as many drains as you want but the water has to go somewhere. Traffic obviously would be another problem. As busy as the roads already are it is now it would only compromise safety for elderly residents [of whom there are many] and children, many of whom enjoy the walks. Pollution is another obvious concern.

The infrastructure and housing strains on most cities are well known but by passing applications such as this is merely putting sticking plasters over the issues. Why cannot LCC be pioneers of change and look at other possible solutions rather than following trends such as build, build, build?

I suppose that in the end money may talk but I intend to fight this as much as I can. Bearing in mind LCC'S advertised philosophy on enhancing and/or protecting constituent's quality of life the whole proposition smacks of hypocrisy.

I would appreciate it if you would take my and my wife's points on board on what is a seriously contentious issue.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Nicholas Card

Representor No: PRS00713

Representation ID: REP06958 Question Ref: H1

Re: Proposal 3085 - Lofthouse

I was astounded to hear that Leeds CC had plans to build 234 houses on the land outlined. At first I thought it was a joke. I have lived in this area for 34 years. This is green belt land in what is realistically an area of outstanding beauty. How can a council which purports itself to "want to make sure that we have a positive impact on the environment" and be "ecologically friendly" with regards to recycling etc. even consider this? When steps are being taken by politicians and welfare groups in general to encouraging children to interconnect and engage with the country side what sort of message does this send out to the pupils of Carlton, Robin Hood and Rodillian schools, the classrooms of which of course we all know are seriously overloaded now. For the first time in my memory we can now wake up to see deer feeding at dawn. At dusk we see bats, which live in the trees in the coppice, fly over as they feed on insects which come off the crops in the fields in question. Furthermore we now have a wonderful farm shop in Carlton village which many of us patronize. I understand the owners plan further expansion in order to make it more children and family friendly. We walk down to the farm shop with our grandchild on a regular basis right past the fields in question in order to buy some provisions on a regular basis and as we do we admire and appreciate our local country side. Farm shop with no farm land? Because this application could of course be the thin end of the wedge.

Another rather important point I would like to make, [in case it has been overlooked] is that it is a well known fact that intensive building has exacerbated flooding problem all over the country causing misery and expense to millions including local authorities. Infrastructures not capable of coping with flash flooding as a result of climate change. Not 25 yards away from the nearest point to the proposed site we have had serious flooding problems over the years and remedial works have been ongoing for the last 6 months causing more disruption. I don't think that covering the neighbouring farm land with houses and roads would bode well. You can build as many drains as you want but the water has to go somewhere. Traffic obviously would be another problem. As busy as the roads already are it is now it would only compromise safety for elderly residents [of whom there are many] and children, many of whom enjoy the walks. Pollution is another obvious concern.

The infrastructure and housing strains on most cities are well known but by passing applications such as this is merely putting sticking plasters over the issues. Why cannot LCC be pioneers of change and look at other possible solutions rather than following trends such as build, build, build?

I suppose that in the end money may talk but I intend to fight this as much as I can. Bearing in mind LCC'S advertised philosophy on enhancing and/or protecting constituent's quality of life the whole proposition smacks of hypocrisy.

I would appreciate it if you would take my and my wife's points on board on what is a seriously contentious issue.

Name: Goldthorpe

Representor No: PRS00929

Representation ID: REP02963 Question Ref: H1

Why does LCC think that any brown (green) field site need to be filled in joining village to village and basically forming one vast metropolis as in Leeds its self where crime and vandalism go together hand in hand. We the people of existing Lofthouse moved here to get away from the turmoil of city life where people live on top of each other only to have our fields plundered by selfinterested builders and council (no).

Schools 1 year ago our granddaughters applied to go to Robin Hood school approx 5 mins walk from their home, the reply was fo to Carlton School approx 20 mins walk, 40 mins with a 5 and 4 year old little girls the reason being the school was full so where are the 400 to 600 children of the new housing scheme going? By car you may say so creaing more danger to the children at the schools as there is no where to park. By foot you may say but in todays society walking is taboo espeically on there commute to work to pay for the said houses. No.

234 dwellings will create between 400 and 600 more cars on the local roads 60% of which will be parked on the roads. 6 new dwellings were built on Cemetery Road on an already dangerous junction and lane single file traffic only. The junction at Longthorpe Lane is a fatality waiting to happen and will basically. More houses more traffic. I have written down my thoughts on the matter and expressed them in writing to you. I will be able to sleep will you. We don't need this housing or want it.

Representor has submitted a drawing of the junction of Green Lane and Leeds Road and the surrounding side streets. As you can see the dangers already exist and can only be made worse by more traffic and pedestrians. Any improvements to the road issues would only be offset by the increase of use and therefore would be largley insignificant in the whole doe to the proximity of schools in the area. LCC is sadly lacking in the road and crossings needed to make this a safe place for children to go too and from school. I will again mention school traffic in the area even after Policy intervention, parking outside schools is a dangerous matter which can only be made worse by more dwellings in the area but there again where will the children go if there is no room at local schools. The parents will take them by car to another village therefore moveing the parking problem but increasing traffic on our local roads putting our children and lives at risk.

Not having seen detailed plans for the said dwellings I cannot comment but I will say that todays developers seem to have gone back in time building large houses on small plits going three or more floors high which reminds me of the tenaments of which people could not wait to get out of and are a nothing but a blot on the landscape as the saying goes cant see the wood for the trees and ugly ones at that. Keep the land as it is develop areas that need it don't build empty offices and sheds pull them down and build there where they should have been in the first place eg Arla Business Park (hunslet) (Stourton) (Holbeck) (Harehills).

Name: Thierry Tanghe

Representor No: PRS01407

Representation ID: REP03534 Question Ref: H1

This site is on gree belt land and should be preserved. Lack of local amenities and particulary the poor access on cemetery road. A very narrow road.

Local schools cannot cope with the additional children this site would bring. They are already at capacity.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: P Louatt

Representor No: PRS01453

Representation ID: REP03585 Question Ref: H1

I am writing to object to the plans for 234 houses on Jumbles Lane – Carlton Lane at Lofthouse.

This plan is absolutely ridiculous. Think of how many people there will be, which doctors are they going to use. Which schools are they going to be going to. Not to mention the traffic.

My Granddaughter lives next door to the Gardeners Arms on Leeds-Wakefield Road, yards from Robin Hood School. But my Great-Granddaughter has to go to Carlton School.

The Planning Application on the lamp posts are right greedy landowners and greedy builders are to blame. Please re-think these plans as I and I suspect many others don't think they are workable

Name: Brigid Watson

Representor No: PRS01808

Representation ID: REP03981 Question Ref: H1

3085

This has always been seen as Green Belt area. Used as agricultural land. Already local schools are overcrowded, with no other facilities for education - at least 4 new housing estates being built in this area during past 5 years. Present economical climate makes it about impossible for people to afford a mortgage.

Representation ID: REP03981 Question Ref: H1

3085

Lack of local amenities for access. Too much traffic using Green Lane, most by leary vehicles and tractors

Name: Ron Hector

Representor No: PRS01843

Representation ID: REP06873 Question Ref: H1

Dear Sirs,
Has anyone considered the elderly residents, who live in sheltered housing along Jumbles Lane.
We came to see out our time in this gem of an area.
Now you want to turn it into a massive building site, shame on you.
It will happen over our dead bodies.
WE will lay down in front of your machines.
[x].

Representation ID: REP06873 Question Ref: H1

Dear Sirs,
Has anyone considered the elderly residents, who live in sheltered housing along Jumbles Lane.
We came to see out our time in this gem of an area.
Now you want to turn it into a massive building site, shame on you.
It will happen over our dead bodies.
WE will lay down in front of your machines.
[x].

Representation ID: REP03997 Question Ref: H1

1. Many older people live in sheltered housing along Jumbles Lane. We chose to live here because of how it is. To change this rural area into a massive building site is vandalism surely there are other sites that would have less impact to local communities.
2. This farm land green belt, our famous rhubarb triangle. Are you going to display this gem of an area for profit?
3. There are no facilities in this area to cater for additional housing and families.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Lorraine Bradburn

Representor No: PRS01845

Representation ID: REP04014 Question Ref: H1

1. At present oversubscribed primary and second schools families moving into the area. Cannot get there children into their local schools.
2. Already major housing development on going in local area. Leeds Road, Robin Hood site on the old lead works. Housing development sorted and not completed.
3. Taking greenbelt land which is limited in the area. Once this site is give the go ahead it won't be long for the other proposed sites to push for planning. "Keep our area a village".

Name: Samantha Ibison

Representor No: PRS01846

Representation ID: REP04016 Question Ref: H1

1. Having recently moved to the area one of the reasons we were drawn back to lofthouse was the beautiful green belt land. I think other brownfield sites with less character should be chosen fir development before this site, the distruction of farming land in the middle of the rhubarb triagal can only be detrimental to the area.

2. Lofthouse is a small village ad I do believe that the local facilities would have the capacity to cope with this number (234 houses) of new residents, schools, local shops, GP's and dentist would be over run. There would also be a huge increase in traffic.

Representation ID: REP06458 Question Ref: H1

Hi

I am writing to express my concerns at the allocation of this area as a potential site for building 234 houses. This area is an outstanding green belt, in my opinion. It is home to many wild birds, butterflies and insects. I believe that by developing this land into a residential site it would completely change the character and beauty of the area. People live in Lofthouse/Carlton because of the space and charm of leaving near farmland.

House prices would decrease at the loss of this landscape. Surely, there are other sites which are already highly developed and would not suffer further from more construction work.

Please reconsider your plans.

Name: Richard Sammells

Representor No: PRS01850

Representation ID: REP04021 Question Ref: H1

Q1, This is greenbelt site and other appropriate site should be considered first ie. Site ref 1261.

Q2, The development is too big and with harm the character of the surrounding area.

Q3, There is a lack of local amenities and all the local schools are full.

Name: Dorothy Ward

Representor No: PRS02357

Representation ID: REP04609 Question Ref: H1

I live opposite the field. I find the view amazing, what a pity if they built on it. It would be a loss to farming land, its in a rural location development would ruin it.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H1

I have lived on Green Lane for nearly 54 years we are used to open fields. There have been houses built in the past, we have had flooding on the crossroads for nearly 20 years, It has been looked to but not tested yet. No school room of Doctors where do they all go? All those houses where is the opening? Surely not on the A61 it is busy at all times.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Eric Colley

Representor No: PRS02525

Representation ID: REP04807 Question Ref: H1

Yes I agree that the site 3085 has been identified as Green but do not agree that it should be considered for allocating for future housing development. Reason This site is part of the heritage of Lofthouse residents. It is a part of our rhubarb triangle- a fact that is known and respected world – wide. Our rhubarb is exported world- wide from this area –even China. Over the years the then Ministry of Agriculture Food and Fisheries upgraded this land to take it out of the previous UDP Development plan in order to stop it from being built upon.

Representation ID: REP04807 Question Ref: H1

I disagree intensely that this 'Greenbelt' site should be used for future housing. I consider that it would constitute a 'Rape' of our village with total disregard for the overwhelming feelings of the vast majority of the residents of Lofthouse. The overall economics of considering 'Greenbelt' sites for housing does not seem to have been considered in the consultation process i.e the loss of production of cereal and vegetable crops, i.e the loss of exports and economic potential of these losses.

Name: Roy Pinson

Representor No: PRS02533

Representation ID: REP04822 Question Ref: H1

A development of this size will clearly destroy the whole character of the area. Have any independent tests been undertaken to establish the effect on air pollution all the extra traffic will have bearing in mind the fact that the M1 and M62 plus the A61 are all fairly close by? Obviously schools will be affected roads need to be improved the A61 is already requiring repair in a number of places! Surely it would be better to build 20 houses in 10 different locations as plots become available rather than destroy for ever beautiful green belt agricultural land.

Name: Jack Linley

Representor No: PRS02534

Representation ID: REP04824 Question Ref: H1

I live in sheltered housing on Jumbles Lane. I cam here because it is peacefull and benefits my health with having COPD. I would not be able to cope with lots of traffic and other problems that will arise

Name: Brian Ferguson

Representor No: PRS02536

Representation ID: REP04823 Question Ref: H2

3085
This land should not be used for building as it is would ruin the landscape, plus extra traffic and congestion of the areas, roads, etc.

Name: James Jewkes

Representor No: PRS02660

Representation ID: REP05110 Question Ref: H1

3085 – site reference

1 We do not want to lose this area of "green belt" land. Where will the access road be – Leeds Road/Jumbles Lane/Cemetery Lane?

2 Where will the extra children go to school? Is there to be another school on more "green belt" land? How much harder will it be to see the doctor? Will Cemetery Lane be widened to accommodate all the extra vehicles?

3 Please do not develop this area to the detriment of others ie the council tax paying villagers (I have been paying for the last 53 years). Do not spoil this area!

Name: Craig Cadman

Representor No: PRS02665

Representation ID: REP05117 Question Ref: H1

3085 Leeds Road. Green to Red.

The site is located within a green belt area.

Why choose to build on a site located in a green belt area when there must be other options available?

What will you provide the community with if you take away green belt land?

With the above question in mind, what are the alternative sites?

The site would be located on a busy road that links Leeds and Wakefield. This is only a single carriageway road, how will the site be accessed?

How will the road be able to support the additional traffic?

What safety measures will be put in place?

Thank you

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: John Stephenson

Representor No: PRS02671

Representation ID: REP05123 Question Ref: H1

3085
This is prime agricultural land forming an important "separation" between the settlements of Lofthouse and Robin Hood. Other sites, particularly unproductive or abandoned agricultural land should be developed first. Green belt land should be developed (if at all) as a last resort. The development will destroy completely the rural character of Lofthouse as it will result in the continuous development of land to the east of Leeds Road from the M62 highway through to the Robin Hood boundary.

Name: Mary Liversedge

Representor No: PRS02672

Representation ID: REP05124 Question Ref: H1

3085
NO. Lack of amenities – local schools already at capacity and pupils already needing to travel away from their local school. Concern about access to site – impact on existing roads. Drainage – existing problem at bottom of Jumbles Lane. This is a green belt and prime agricultural land, therefore, brownfield should be considered first.

Name: Phillip Reid

Representor No: PRS02676

Representation ID: REP05127 Question Ref: H1

3085 – site reference
Green belt and first and foremost internationally recognised area for growing crops (rhubarb especially). Potentially desecrated area identified as factually INCORRECT as site is NOT bound on 3 sides by property. Village cannot sustain that large a development economically and transport/roads.
Personally – devastating effect on the value of our property as the front of our outlook is directly onto site/area and we would welcome a meet/consultation and practically demand it. (We live next to the care home 'railroaded' through by Planning.
Ruin rural location, diversion of electrical lines/substation at corner of site, damage local wildlife with urban 'sprawl'.

Name: Robin And Pamela Lawrence

Representor No: PRS02695

Representation ID: REP07082 Question Ref: H1

Site 3085 Leeds Road Lofthouse - Green to Red
We feel very strongly that there should be NO building on Green Belt land. There must be plenty of land that could be built on that is not Green Belt.
Planning permission should NOT be given for 234 new houses to be built on the farm land in the area of Leeds Road, Jumbles Lane, Cemetery Lane, Lofthouse. The traffic in this area is already excessive and more vehicles accessing these roads is unacceptable and dangerous. Farm land is for growing crops, not for building houses on.
We hope that the Council will reject this planning application and any others relating to Green Belt land.

Representation ID: REP05149 Question Ref: H1

We feel very strongly that there should be NO building on Green Belt land. There must be plenty of land that could be built on that is not Green Belt.
Planning permission should NOT be given for 234 new houses to be built on the farm land in the area of Leeds Road, Jumbles Lane, Cemetery Lane, Lofthouse. The traffic in this area is already excessive and more vehicles accessing these roads is unacceptable and dangerous. Farm land is for growing crops, not for building houses on.
We hope that the Council will reject this planning application and any others relating to Green Belt land.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: J E Battle

Representor No: PRS02797

Representation ID: REP05343 Question Ref: H1

Objection to green

I would like to formally object to the proposal to build 234 homes on green belt land at Lofthouse. The reasons for this are listed below:

Brownfield sites should be considered before any proposals are out forward for new builds on green belt land.

The world renowned "Rhubarb Triangle" should be preserved; the land is in the heart of that.

I have seen bats flying around the coppice and in the trees which are in the centre of the proposed site. In addition to this, I have seen deer in the fields which is a rare but very welcome sight. There is also plenty of wildlife and all of this would be lost if this proposal goes ahead.

With regards to the local schools, I see there are already plans in place to increase capacity therefore if the proposed homes were built how would the Council cope with the additional numbers of children who would need an education?

In terms of roads, traffic increase and general highway maintenance there would be a significant impact to all of these which needs to be taken into account.

Based on all of the above (and I could list more reasons), I would be grateful if you help us to keep this beautiful farmland and not allow anyone to build 234 homes.

If you need any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Representation ID: REP06405 Question Ref: H1

I would like to formally object to the proposal to build 234 homes on green belt land at Lofthouse. The reasons for this are listed below:

Brownfield sites should be considered before any proposals are out forward for new builds on green belt land.

The world renowned "Rhubarb Triangle" should be preserved; the land is in the heart of that.

I have seen bats flying around the coppice and in the trees which are in the centre of the proposed site. In addition to this, I have seen deer in the fields which is a rare but very welcome sight. There is also plenty of wildlife and all of this would be lost if this proposal goes ahead.

With regards to the local schools, I see there are already plans in place to increase capacity therefore if the proposed homes were built how would the Council cope with the additional numbers of children who would need an education?

In terms of roads, traffic increase and general highway maintenance there would be a significant impact to all of these which needs to be taken into account.

Based on all of the above (and I could list more reasons), I would be grateful if you help us to keep this beautiful farmland and not allow anyone to build 234 homes.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Laura Grayston

Representor No: PRS02825

Representation ID: REP05379 Question Ref: H1

Objection to green

I wish to register the strongest possible protest against plans to build 234 houses on greenbelt land in Lofthouse. As a resident of Thorpe Lodge, the apartment complex facing plot 3085, I will be directly impacted by the proposed build. Yet I have not been informed of the proposed scheme by letter, there are no signs in the local area, and I have since learned that meetings have been held in Thorpe and Tingley but not Lofthouse. Quite simply, I am outraged that we have not been better informed of the plans to spoil the world-famous Rhubarb Triangle. This area is not wasteland; it is farmland and "has been an important part of the local economy for over 150 years" (Council website), attracting visitors from across the world. Yorkshire Forced Rhubarb was awarded Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) status by the European Commission's Protected Food Name scheme recently, which puts it on a par with Champagne. A book, Walks in the Rhubarb Triangle, was even published; will this now be renamed Walks in the Housing Estate?

Whilst I recognize the need for new housing, I am dismayed that this rural location is thought suitable for development. Already we have lost so many of our green spaces in south Leeds, with housing estates throughout Robin Hood and Rothwell, and there is a grave danger that we will lose all our heritage, character and community, becoming another part of the "concrete jungle". After all, the fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.

I also fear that there are insufficient resources in Lofthouse to cope, with our schools, dental practices and doctors' surgeries already full to capacity and the traffic on our roads at the busy junction where Long Thorpe Lane and Jumbles Lane cross Leeds Road already at dangerous levels.

Finally, the long and noisy build will disturb the serenity of the many elderly residents who live nearby in Council accommodation and visitors to Lofthouse Cemetery, which includes Commonwealth war graves.

I sincerely hope that you can be prevented from making this very serious error before it is too late and the whole of "God's own county" is under concrete and brick.

Name: Julie Bulmer

Representor No: PRS02830

Representation ID: REP05372 Question Ref: H1

I am writing to you to say how strongly we oppose your plans to build 234? New houses in Lofthouse (Jumbles Lane, Cemetery Lane, Long Thorpe Lane) on green belt land. I was born and bred in this area and anyone who lives in Lofthouse and Carlton lives here for good reasons, mainly peace and tranquility. After marrying, I lived in Rothwell. We moved back to the above address only one year ago. There are many beneficial factors for moving back into the area. The views over surrounding farm lands being one of them. The complete peace, tranquility, community spirit and closeness that this area offers, another. Hardly anyone in the surrounding areas are even aware of these proposals and would be horrified to learn of them. Maybe canvassing, door to door and asking for opinions would show you that no one would be in favour. But after all we live here and so we should be asked our views. It seems to us, this whole proposal has been kept quite from locals and hushed up!

There are many good reasons why this proposal shouldn't go ahead

1. The loss of yet more green belt land
2. The loss of a community spirit
3. Primary Schools and High School places are not available. Parents of reception class children are being turned away from Carlton Primary and given such silly alternatives as Gildersome!! So, it would seem, the local schools are full, not a good selling point.
4. Doctors surgeries already fit to bursting appointments - usually a wait for two weeks. So surgeries are struggling, not a good selling point.
5. The volume of traffic would be a huge danger (especially for school children). Building would mean a higher volume of heavy lorries on completely unsuitable roads, such as Cemetery Lane.

So, to end this opposition letter, I would urge you, please reconsider this most unsuitable proposal. Please don't ruin something so beautiful, that locals hold dear

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Joseph & Vera Mawson

Representor No: PRS02837

Representation ID: REP05392 Question Ref: H1

Objection to green

OBJECTION TO PLANNING OF 234 HOUSES
JUMBLES LANE LOFTHOUSE.

Lofthouse,Rothwell,Lofthouse Gate,Outwood. Over the last 30-40 years has become the building planners metropolis. What was once a village has been savaged by Moterways and housing developments in every nook and cranny. Farm land is being swallowed up,the schools are overflowing, doctors appointments hard to come by. The A61 is a nightmare to cross due to increase in traffic,the corner of Jumles Lane where they plan to build 234 new homes there are elderley people living in a complex that as always been a safe environment.But also the access to the A61 is absolutely dangerous what with the children from Rodillian school most of whom seem to have cars. To increase the amount of traffic to this area will be criminal, also the GREEN BELT AREA IS DECREASING RAPIDLY.The famous "Rhubarb Triangle"will be no more.

Representation ID: REP05391 Question Ref: H1

OBJECTION TO PLANNING OF 234 HOUSES
JUMBLES LANE LOFTHOUSE.

Lofthouse,Rothwell,Lofthouse Gate,Outwood. Over the last 30-40 years has become the building planners metropolis. What was once a village has been savaged by Moterways and housing developments in every nook and cranny. Farm land is being swallowed up,the schools are overflowing, doctors appointments hard to come by. The A61 is a nightmare to cross due to increase in traffic,the corner of Jumles Lane where they plan to build 234 new homes there are elderley people living in a complex that as always been a safe environment.But also the access to the A61 is absolutely dangerous what with the children from Rodillian school most of whom seem to have cars. To increase the amount of traffic to this area will be criminal, also the GREEN BELT AREA IS DECREASING RAPIDLY.The famous "Rhubarb Triangle"will be no more.

Name: David Stuart Smith

Representor No: PRS03041

Representation ID: REP00754 Question Ref: H1

One of the sites listed is unsuitable to consider allocating for future housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP00754 Question Ref: H2

Site ref.3085 The Grange, 308 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, WF3 3RU.1) This site is a Green Belt site and is the last remaining open space between Lofthouse and Robin Hood. Allowing further ribbon development along the A61 would seriously damage the village status and community feel of Lofthouse, which is already affected by its intersection by the M62.2) The site is prime arable land which should not be sacrificed to the interests and profits of property developers. Once developed, the site could never be returned to farm land.3) The site allocations plan erroneously states that the site is surrounded by development on three sides. This is patently not the case; whilst the potential for sprawl may be restricted by roads, A61 and Jumbles Lane/ Cemetery Road on two sides, the majority of the perimeter has an open aspect over the cemetery and farm land.3) Green Lane already suffers from its over-use as a shortcut from the A61 to the M62 J30, A further 234 houses at the end of the road will further exacerbate the traffic problem.4) There are two dangerous crossroads on the roads bordering the site, i.e. A61/B6135 and B6135/Carlton Lane/Cemetery Lane. A further 468 cars (assuming two car families) must constitute an increased risk of accidents in an area used regularly by pedestrians and pupils of nearby Rodillian School.5) The road around the Jumbles/Green/Carlton/Cemetery lanes junction is prone to flash flooding. To build houses, drives and roads over this arable site will reduce the 'soakaway' benefit of the field and could increase the risk of localised flooding on Green Lane.6) The local primary school is already overflowing and the likely influx of children from 234 households could threaten its 'Outstanding' status.7) The people of Lofthouse do not want this development.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Colin Dawson

Representor No: PRS03138

Representation ID: REP01515 Question Ref: H1

First of all Lofthouse should not be classed along with Ardsley and Robin Hood as these are separate villages. In fact Ardsley is separate from Lofthouse by a motorway. Also, according to the paper "Outer South West Housing Market Characteristic area" 5.8.3 There is insufficient outdoor sports provision 5.2.2 There is insufficient parks and gardens 5.17.1 There is insufficient children's play areas

Therefore any land identified as green should first be considered to add to these needs and not build houses on. Brownfield sites should be considered first.

Representation ID: REP01515 Question Ref: H5

3085. I have already given my reasons at H1 etc.

Representation ID: REP01515 Question Ref: H2

Site reference- 3035. The calculations used to justify this site are based on irrational or unreasonable assumptions when considering the "The natural green space Ardsley and Robin Hood" including Lofthouse. The item at 5.24 should be discounted in consideration of green space for the following reason. At item 5.24 a list is provided of so-called natural green space with a sum of all of these spaces producing 115.390 HA. This has then been divided by the population number to give a figure of over 5 HA per 1,000 population, thus asserting that there is more than enough provision. However this list also includes Ardsley reservoir being 32.364 HA. If, then all of the other areas of land on this particular list were built upon and the population divided into the Ardsley reservoir area it would give a figure of 1.47 HA per 1,000 population. The argument being promulgated being that as long as this is above the arbitrary figure of 0.7 HA per 1,000 population there is enough green space! No rational person would consider this lumping together of unusable water (you can fish in it and walk around it that is all!) area as being included in any calculation of natural green space as being a reasonable way to calculate "natural green space". Furthermore Ardsley reservoir is not "natural" in the sense that most ordinary people would class it, as it is man made. Further reasons for objections. 1. The site is currently used for agriculture and should remain so as there is a need for produce locally thus avoiding adding to greenhouse gases by transporting produce from a long way away, possibly overseas if we do not produce enough food of our own. Food production should take precedence over housing need. 2. The character of rural Lofthouse as a village would be harmed. 3. There are insufficient amenities to cope with the increase in population as shown in my comments at box H1. 4. There are insufficient services (schools etc.) to cope with an increase in population. 5. There is insufficient infrastructure (Roads, rail stations for travel etc.) to support a massive increase in houses

Name: Joanna Hammond

Representor No: PRS03296

Representation ID: REP01403 Question Ref: H2

3085 Too large a site for a rural location with a lack of amenities in walking distance. This will add strain to the local roads and the schools. A development of this size will harm the character of the local villages and the famous Rhubarb Triangle. Farming land will be lost. Also the local bus service no longer goes along Jumbles Lane & Green Lane.

Name: Nigel Radford

Representor No: PRS03315

Representation ID: REP01382 Question Ref: H2

REF...3085...THIS SITE IF BUILT ON WILL CAUSE ABSOLUTE MAYHEM TO THE TRAFFIC PROBLEMS WE HAVE ALREADY WITH ALL THE NEW BUILDS THAT HAVE GONE UP RECENTLY. I PERSONALLY HAVE WITNESSED 3 NEAR ACCIDENTS AND ONE ACTUAL ONE ONLY 75 METRES FROM MY HOUSE. THIS SITE WOULD TENFOLD THOSE FIGURES. ALONG WITH SAFETY OF OUR COMMUNITY THE PROBLEM OF NOT HAVING ANY SCHOOLING TO ACCOMMODATE THIS SITE WOULD BE AN ABSOLUTE JOKE. THE ROADS SURROUNDING THE AREA ARE BY NO WAY BIG ENOUGH TO CARRY THE EXTRA TRAFFIC. THEY ARE COUNTRY LANES IN MOST CASES. IT WILL DAMAGE THE ONLY BIT OF OPEN LAND WE HAVE IN THIS VILLAGE, NOT TO MENTION THE FAMOUS RHUBARB TRIANGLE.

Name: Janet Dobson

Representor No: PRS03431

Representation ID: REP01994 Question Ref: H1

This is a green belt site, set in the Rhubarb Triangle, which should be preserved. The site would spoil the character of Robinhood/Lofthouse, there a lack of amenities to support the development of such a vast quantity of houses. Local schools eg Carlton, Robinhood and Rodillian could not sustain the influx of more children. The Doctors, Dentists etc., are the same they are struggling with the numbers now. Increase in traffic, roads not suitable to take more vehicles, drainage also a problem with localised flooding, which more housing would add to this already increasing problem

Representation ID: REP01994 Question Ref: H2

Site reference 3085 Jumbles Lane, Lofthouse 234 planned houses Not suitable as highlighted in the above

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Elyse Drake

Representor No: PRS03588

Representation ID: REP00706 Question Ref: H1

This is a green belt area which should not be used for development. There has been considerable development locally already.

Representation ID: REP00706 Question Ref: H3

3085 is green.

Representation ID: REP00706 Question Ref: H11

3085 is not suitable for development due to the local traffic and lack of amenities/facilities/schools.

Representation ID: REP00706 Question Ref: H2

This site 3085, listed as having a capacity of 234 properties, is far too large for the surrounding area to cope with. The housing will need access from the main A61 Leeds Road - fast moving traffic and Leadwell Lane/Jumbles Lane which are used to local traffic only. Not only will these properties cause considerable problems in their development, there are no schools/shops or local facilities sufficient to cater for the occupants. The local Academy children all walk around this area, both to and from school as well as children walking to Robin Hood primary and Carlton. The development would cause major disruption to the safety of road users and pedestrians and the occupants would not have no facilities for such a large build.

Name: Charles Offord

Representor No: PRS04171

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H1

Sites on Gree Belt land which should be preservedOther sites including brownfield in particular should be considered first. Site 308 will be harmful to the character of the village which is in a rural location.Site 308 - A lack of local amenities and poor access to the development means that it will result in a significant increase in car journeys on minor village roads, can the roads cope.Loss of key farming land.Some of the sites are in the famous "Rhubarb Triangle".The development take no consideration of local amenities and infrastructure including schools, GPs etc.Some of the sites are in a rural location and is not a sustainable development.Proposed sites join up settlements like Lofthouse, Carlton and Robin Hood

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H5

3085no consultationThere are some basic flaws in the site reference assessment done as part of the SHLAA. Inaccuracies, ignored TPO in middle of the site, says the site has development on 3 sides which is wrong, nearest railway station wrong, highway assessment wrong. The site is named the wrong reference and quotes planning permission from another address, my residence!!!It blocks the spacial area and creates opportunity for further urban sprawl

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: General comment

I think there are a number of flaws in the detail on site reference 3085 which I will be writing to the planning department on.Local awareness of the proposals is very low and was only alerted to this by a letter through my door

Representation ID: REP01995 Question Ref: H2

Site Reference 3085Resident objection to the development of 234 housesI strongly object to any form of housing development on greenbelt land and in particular this proposed site reference 3085 for the site allocation plans for Leeds.The site is on Green Belt land which should be preserved. The government's standard note (SN/SC/934) of 14th January 2013 confirms the government's policy on protection for the green belt set out in chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF states that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as "inappropriate" for the green belt. Other sites including brownfield in particular should be considered first. Whilst it is accepted that housing targets need to be strived upon, this should not be before all brownfield and regeneration opportunities have been exhausted. This site further erodes the agricultural land which lies between Leeds and Wakefield adding to the erosion of the boundaries of these two cities with sprawling settlements. As well as the erosion of the space between Leeds and Wakefield it also The proposed site 3085 blocks in the view of the open countryside and further urbanises an area that already has one of the largest motorways interchanges in the UK sited!This site's proposal takes no account of the lack of local amenities and poor access to the site that will result in a significant increase in car journeys on minor village roads. The main access proposed is along an old lane which runs into the settlement of Carlton which has already experienced a number of accidents and this development will further exasperate a trouble spot.The land lies in the centre of the famous "Rhubarb Triangle". Recognised across the world as a centre for Rhubarb production this proposed development does not consider the loss of a key part of the heritage of the area. Despite receiving recognition for the area and the right to label local produce from the "Rhubarb Triangle" this de3velopment destroys this valuable local heritage. The development is too large and disproportion to the area and this would cause massive pressure on local facilities and amenities which appear to have been totally ignored in this assessment. Local schools are currently struggling to cope, Carlton Primary School, Robin Hood and Rodillian Secondary School are at capacity and do not have spare places.Wiping our hedgerows, trees, scrub and valuable agricultural land to build houses would have a negative impact on the area's biodiversity and wildlife population as well as the open access and views across to the settlement of Carlton and this site should not be endorsed.For these reasons I am vehemently opposed to any form of housing development on this site.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Lorraine Offord

Representor No: PRS04301

Representation ID: REP01991 Question Ref: H11

I think siter 3085 should not be build on at all.

Representation ID: REP01991 Question Ref: H2

I strongly object to any form of housing development on greenbelt land and in particular this proposed site reference 3085 for the site allocation plans for Leeds. The site is on Green Belt land which should be preserved. The government's standard note (SN/SC/934) of 14th January 2013 confirms the government's policy on protection for the green belt set out in chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF states that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as "inappropriate" for the green belt. Other sites including brownfield in particular should be considered first. Whilst it is accepted that housing targets need to be strived upon, this should not be before all brownfield and regeneration opportunities have been exhausted. This site further erodes the agricultural land which lies between Leeds and Wakefield adding to the erosion of the boundaries of these two cities with sprawling settlements. As well as the erosion of the space between Leeds and Wakefield it also The proposed site 3085 blocks in the view of the open countryside and further urbanises an area that already has one of the largest motorways interchanges in the UK sited! This site's proposal takes no account of the lack of local amenities and poor access to the site that will result in a significant increase in car journeys on minor village roads. The main access proposed is along an old lane which runs into the settlement of Carlton which has already experienced a number of accidents and this development will further exasperate a trouble spot. The land lies in the centre of the famous "Rhubarb Triangle". Recognised across the world as a centre for Rhubarb production this proposed development does not consider the loss of a key part of the heritage of the area. Despite receiving recognition for the area and the right to label local produce from the "Rhubarb Triangle" this de3velopment destroys this valuable local heritage. The development is too large and disproportion to the area and this would cause massive pressure on local facilities and amenities which appear to have been totally ignored in this assessment. Local schools are currently oversubscribed for intake, Carlton Primary School, Robin Hood and Rodillian Secondary School are at capacity and do not have spare places. Wiping our hedgerows, trees, scrub and valuable agricultural land to build houses would have a negative impact on the area's biodiversity and wildlife population as well as the open access and views across to the settlement of Carlton and this site should not be endorsed.

Name: Joanne Reid

Representor No: PRS04389

Representation ID: REP00614 Question Ref: H1

I have lived adjacent to site 3085 for 16 years, in that time there have been numerous developments in the area. Lofthouse was once a pleasant area to live in but now it seems every area of greenspace is being spoiled by housing. The area referred to is a favourite with ramblers and dog walkers and in my opinion should be kept as green belt. The area adjacent to my dwelling has already been given over to the building of a 93 bedded residential home for the elderly, including a wing for elderly patients with dementia. This development took 18 months to build and went from being a small (44 beds) proposed care home to 93 beds without (to our knowledge) further permissions being sought. The care home is enormous and has already had a detrimental effect with increasing traffic and noise, it is not unusual to have ambulances drawing up outside at all hours day or night. The development has also directly affected the outlook from my home. You state in your report that the proposed site is 'surrounded by development' on three sides. This is simply not the case. The houses directly surrounding the area are all in very small pockets of residential dwellings, most enjoying undisturbed views of Rothwell and the surrounding area. One of the things that puts Lofthouse on the agricultural map is the 'Rhubarb Triangle'. What will we be famous for if 234 newhouses are built here? Very busy roads more overcrowding in our already overcrowded local schools and a glut of houses to Let. The area is flooded with 'affordable' housing and new developments are springing up all the time. A development of 3 blocks of private flats is currently under construction on land opposite The Grange. I really do feel that the construction of 234 new homes in this particular area of Lofthouse will definitely have a detrimental affect. We are already devoid of any greenspace for walking and recreation in Lofthouse, the Rothwell way is the only 'green area' I can think of, this development will also encroach on this area too.

Representation ID: REP00614 Question Ref: General comment

I do feel very passionately about my area, I would hate to see it spoilt even further.

Representation ID: REP00614 Question Ref: H2

I have lived adjacent to site 3085 for 16 years, in that time there have been numerous developments in the area. Lofthouse was once a pleasant area to live in but now it seems every area of greenspace is being spoiled by housing. The area referred to is a favourite with ramblers and dog walkers and in my opinion should be kept as green belt. The area adjacent to my dwelling has already been given over to the building of a 93 bedded residential home for the elderly, including a wing for elderly patients with dementia. This development took 18 months to build and went from being a small (44 beds) proposed care home to 93 beds without (to our knowledge) further permissions being sought. The care home is enormous and has already had a detrimental effect with increasing traffic and noise, it is not unusual to have ambulances drawing up outside at all hours day or night. The development has also directly affected the outlook from my home. You state in your report that the proposed site is 'surrounded by development' on three sides. This is simply not the case. The houses directly surrounding the area are all in very small pockets of residential dwellings, most enjoying undisturbed views of Rothwell and the surrounding area. One of the things that puts Lofthouse on the agricultural map is the 'Rhubarb Triangle'. What will we be famous for if 234 newhouses are built here? Very busy roads more overcrowding in our already overcrowded local schools and a glut of houses to Let. The area is flooded with 'affordable' housing and new developments are springing up all the time. A development of 3 blocks of private flats is currently under construction on land opposite The Grange. I really do feel that the construction of 234 new homes in this particular area of Lofthouse will definitely have a detrimental affect. We are already devoid of any greenspace for walking and recreation in Lofthouse, the Rothwell way is the only 'green area' I can think of, this development will also encroach on this area too.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Amanda Thompson

Representor No: PRS04439

Representation ID: REP00942 Question Ref: H5

map 29 reference 12611 do not agree with this site being developed as there are limited access points as it runs next to the m62. There is a historic dismantled railway running through this site which would harm not only the site itself but also the flora and fauna that live here. There is a large site (3085) that has been selected for development which would surpass the housing that we need for this area. What about the amenities and schools for all these houses.

Representation ID: REP00942 Question Ref: H2

map 29 reference 12611 don't agree with this proposed site as it is situated next to the m62 with very poor access into and from. This area is a natural barrier from the motorway. There is a historical disused railway running through this area which is home to many native trees and wildlife. Our community is limited for schools and amenities and with the proposed green site (3085) allocated for housing I feel that no more is required in our immediate area.

Name: Margaret Dwyar

Representor No: PRS04729

Representation ID: REP00809 Question Ref: H1

there has been too much development in the area already making a small community into a vast metropolis spoiling the area and only benefiting the developer not the existing community due to the increase housing road traffic has dramatically increased putting the local community at risk and the tidiness and cleanliness of the area way down but we have seen no reductions in rates and no investment in the area for the houses already built

Representation ID: REP00809 Question Ref: H2

3085 I don't think it should be spoilt leave us some land to look over and enjoy like our parents did

Name: Jean Banks

Representor No: PRS04868

Representation ID: REP01289 Question Ref: H1

I wish to object for the following reasons: the site is on green belt land and there is no special reason why this area should be lost. The schools in the area are already over subscribed and further housing would add to the problems of schooling. The busy roads in the surrounding area would add to even more congestion on the already busy A61 and on the rat run on Green Lane. This is a very important green belt site that should be preserved to ensure the rural village status between Robin Hood, Lofthouse and Carlton. The people of Lofthouse do not want this development and there are other brownfield sites that can be considered.

Representation ID: REP01289 Question Ref: H2

Site Lofthouse Grange 3085 for the above reasons.

Name: Sheila Colley

Representor No: PRS05027

Representation ID: REP05593 Question Ref: H1

First of all may I say I am absolutely disgusted and appalled at the thought of using superb Green Belt farmland for building properties on? It is after all part of the "Rubarb Triange" and will rob the village of Lofthouse of its semi-rural identity. Regarding the cops of trees on this site this must be protected as it is a habitat for animals and wildlife, ***** flora. I was given to understand that there are graves on this site. We do not have enough school places or doctors services to support this proposed build as the services are stretched to breaking point already. Regarding access and exits from the land this is a "NO NO" as for Leeds Road is concerned and Cemetery Lane is far too narrow and winding for this purpose. Extensive re-configuration would be a complete upheaval of the local road system. I also understand that there is shallow mine workings under the land. There are parts of the land substantially larger than this which would be available which are off Aberford Road, Rothwell near Rennington Lane., 30 acres, which is a Brown field Site and also 26 acres off Swithens Lane Rothwell. Why are they site not considered before this one? Our village garage has applied to dispose of the garage and bungalow to open their land but this has been refused because it is "Green Belt" land. It appears to me that there is one rule for one application and a different one for this one. IS MONEY INVOLVED HERE!!!!

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Louise Bland

Representor No: PRS05143

Representation ID: REP05721 Question Ref: H1

With reference to the above mentioned site I would like to raise my objection to this application.

As a local resident who runs past here on a daily basis I have great concern over the increase of traffic flow etc. This application is also contrary to Green Belt policy, with no compelling case being made to set aside this policy.

Any such development of this site would be harmful to the local environment and safety. The noise and disturbance from vehicles and activity on the site together with the present traffic would be totally unbearable and only add further concerns and issues to an area which already has a known issue around traffic and parking.

The development would be too large for the surrounding infrastructure and small villages to cope with - especially the schools which have no spare places and the small rural roads.

I do hope you consider my objection and take into the account the seriousness of the impact of this.

Name: Neil Bradford

Representor No: PRS05152

Representation ID: REP05730 Question Ref: H1

I respectfully ask that my objection to the proposed development be recorded.

The points I wish to raise in support of the objection are as follows:

Firstly the proposed site is Green Belt land and would imply a loss of farming land that is synonymous with the Rhubarb Triangle.

There is a brownfield site nearby on Thorpe Lower Lane, that should be considered first.

The development will be detrimental to the character of the village. There will be a significant increase in the amount of traffic on minor roads. The local schools cannot cope with the increase in capacity. The primary's are at capacity and Rodillian Academy is already over subscribed. As a school governor I am well aware of the capacities of the local schools.

The size of the development is detrimental to the area as a whole and would significantly alter the aesthetics of the surrounding villages.

Name: A Dodgson

Representor No: PRS05162

Representation ID: REP05741 Question Ref: H1

Please accept this e-mail as a formal objection against allowing permission to build on land in Lofthouse, Wakefield. The deadline for these objections is later today.

To consider building on this green belt land is wrong in many ways not least for the detrimental effect on the wildlife living in the island in the middle of the plot.

From a personal stand point it could also bring back the flooding problem that Yorkshire Water has only just spent thousands remedying.

My property is the epicentre for flash floods and I can imagine that any reduction in land to absorb water would have a potentially devastating effect on my property. Yorkshire Water have recently replaced damaged and blocked drains to compensate for the much smaller housing development on Cemetery Lane. This development added to the existing flooding problem and thankfully it appears the work done has had the desired effects as they coped well with Sunday mornings torrential down pour. I do NOT want to go back to the worry that has surrounded me for many years just to satisfy a property developer.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: John And Janet Claybrough

Representor No: PRS05564

Representation ID: REP06214 Question Ref: H1

3085
We strongly object to this proposed housing development. Whilst recognising that we need more houses, there are many reasons why this location is inappropriate. Additional traffic on narrow Jumbles Lane and Cemetery Lane would not only cause congestion but, in our view, would be dangerous.
It would also destroy a natural dividing line between Lofthouse, Carlton and Robin Hood, an important part of the visitor-attracting Rhubarb Triangle, and leave these diverse villages as a single sprawl.
Do we know whether the local schools, doctors and other facilities would be able to absorb another 600/700 residents?
Finally, are you aware that the area has suffered frequent flooding over the past 30 years? Yorkshire Water has recently improved the drainage infrastructure but we have yet to see whether the problem has been resolved. Even if it has, the loss of a water-absorbing field and its replacement by numerous roads and other hard surfaces would probably take us back to square one.
This development should not be approved.

Name: Persimmon Homes

Representor No: PRS05691

Representation ID: REP05956 Question Ref: H1

Site 3085

Summary

In response to Question H1, Site 3085 comprises a suitable and highly sustainable location for residential development use in support of the Council's own conclusion that the site has the greatest potential of all the alternative sites in Lofthouse to be allocated for housing within the Publication Draft, and subsequently adopted version, of the Site Allocations DPD.

Both the Council's and Persimmon's own Green Belt Assessments demonstrate that development of the site for much needed housing will in no way compromise the purpose of the Green Belt as set out within NPPF.
There are no technical or land ownership issues that would prevent the site coming forward for housing development, with a greater number of dwellings than currently indicated within the Site Allocations Plan.
The Council's initial recommendation should therefore be supported and the site should be allocated for housing development within the next stage of the Site Allocations Plan.

See also representation submitted for full details

Representation ID: REP05956 Question Ref: H11

Phasing (Question H11)

This section of the report considers the timing of the delivery of housing at Site 3085 in response to Question H11.

It is noted that reference to the SHLAA within the site assessment proforma indicates the availability of the site as 'Unknown' with an achievability date in the long term (11 years plus).

Contrary to the findings of the SHLAA, and as set out in detail in Section 2.0 above, there are no technical barriers which would prevent the immediate commencement of residential development at the site following the grant of planning permission. The site is within the sole control of Persimmon Homes who have ascertained the economic viability of housing development and are committed to the early development of housing. There is no need for significant infrastructure provision which would prevent delivery of the site in the short term.

The site should therefore form part of the first phase of allocations and be allocated for the delivery of new housing in the short term (0-5 years) in order to provide for the early delivery of site regeneration benefits and much needed housing in the Outer South.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H1

3085 The Grange, Leeds Road, Lofthouse – I disagree with the designation of this site as Green. It should be Red. This site is Green Belt. It is not surrounded on three sides by development as stated in the consultation document. There is limited development on the three smallest parts of the 7 sided shape of this site (unless we are counting the cemetery). Consequently the proposals would amount to unrestricted urban sprawl into the Green Belt. If allowed to be developed this site would irrevocably change the character of the village of Lofthouse, which to date retains a semi-rural feel on the outskirts of both Leeds and Wakefield. It would lead to the loss of prime agricultural land in the famous Rhubarb Triangle. The sheer volume of houses proposed is unsustainable as the local schools (Primary and Secondary) are full already, the Doctor's surgery is at capacity and Cemetery Lane and Green Lane/Jumbles Lane are not designed to support the additional volume of traffic. It is hard to believe that no highways issues have been raised given that highways issues are already a concern in the local area in terms of speed and volume of traffic along the Leeds Road and Green Lane/Jumbles Lane. There are concerns about additional flooding in the area if the natural soakaway in the farmer's fields is lost because it has been built over. Yorkshire Water have had to undertake extensive work this year to remedy existing flooding to homes on Green Lane because the drainage systems could not cope with the existing flow of run-off water from the land uphill which includes this site.

Name: Sheila Stones

Representor No: PRS05747

Representation ID: REP06418 Question Ref: H1

I am writing to object to the proposed development of 234 houses on the Rhubarb Triangle. My name is Miss Sheila Stones and my address is 9 Jumbles Court, Lofthouse,. Thank you.

Name: N Milner

Representor No: PRS05748

Representation ID: REP06419 Question Ref: H1

I write with reference to the above site application and to put forward my objections. I feel that all Green Belt land should be kept just that Green Belt and feel that Brownfield sites should be considered first.

When I purchased my property I took into consideration the local surroundings and the kind of upbringing I want to bring my family up in. I did not want to be in the middle of hundreds and hundreds of houses and this green belt land contributed to my decision of buying my house. I can only feel that it will bring the property prices down as it will not be a sought after area like it is now.

I also feel that it is good to keep the heritage for the world famous Rhubarb Triangle and feel that keeping Britain's farming going is just as important or we will end up having to import our crops making them more expensive than they already are. It will only have a bad impact on our schools at Carlton, Robin Hood and Rodillian in Lofthouse as they are already over subscribed as it is. It is already difficult to get appointments at our local services i.e doctors and dentists and having all these extra families in the area will only make it much more difficult.

Adding to the above I can not imagine how much of a bad effect it will have on our already over crowded roads and feel that the already difficult commute to both cities of Leeds and Wakefield will make and peak hour traffic a lot worse, our village roads can only just cope with the traffic that it has now.

I feel very angry at the proposals and think everyone in our community will feel the same too.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Karen Renshaw

Representor No: PRS06048

Representation ID: REP06876 Question Ref: H1

Sites 3081A, 3085 & 3445A - Green to Red

I wish to make some formal objections to the proposals set out in the documents regarding the site allocation plans.

- Church Farm , WF3 3SA – 1261 Proposal to build 144 houses
- Hope Farm - 3081 Part A & B Proposal to build 279 properties
- The Grange -3085 Proposal to build 234 homes
- Leadwell Lane - 3445A Proposed 60 properties

The above sites are within the Rothwell side of Ardsley & Robin Hood. All the schools within this area are already full to their capacity and some are already being extended. The infrastructure has already been over accommodating and the amenities within this region of the Ward are insufficient to facilitate current residents. Due to recent development work the roads have become busier and safety elements have had to be implemented. It is a sad situation when local residents cannot attend their local schools and yet the transport cannot accommodate the alternatives given. The green space is a key feature, that which is left and its an area valued by all within this community.

The increase in traffic, noise , pollution as well as the damage to our environment, removing historical elements and eliminating the rhubarb triangle would be detrimental to health and well- being of local residents.This would impact on our young children who already struggle to get appointments at our local GP's

I strongly oppose the above proposals and hope that these aspects, along with those of local residents who managed to be informed of this process, will be considered before any decisions are made.

Name: Susan Smith

Representor No: PRS06050

Representation ID: REP06893 Question Ref: H1

Site Name & Reference: The Grange 3085

I wish to object to the above site being allocated for future housing development for the following reasons:

I have lived in the village of Lofthouse most of my life and I have seen the village divided by the M62 to which we lost our beautiful village cricket ground and saw a division of the community. To build on this site would lose the village feel altogether with no division between Robin Hood and Lofthouse. This site provides the rural feel that is quickly disappearing from Leeds all the way to Wakefield.

Robin Hood School is already expanding to accommodate the rising birth rate, to a point it will not be able to expand further, it is already oversubscribed, this site would have a dramatic impact on local schools.

There have been problems on Green Lane with flooding, which has supposedly been rectified, taking away this arable farming land would increase the risk of flooding as there would be a massive reduction in soak off area.

Green Lane is already a 'Rat Run' to and from the M62 and the increase in traffic would have a dramatic impact on residents on this road.

Entrances on to the already busy A61 Leeds Road, which has the dangerous crossroad near Rodillian School, would increase the risk of accidents for parents and children using local schools, also the narrow road of Cemetery Lane with narrow footpaths would endanger pedestrians heading to the village of Carlton.

There are elderly residents on Jumbles Lane in sheltered housing, most who have lived in this village all their lives, to take away the rural view for the sake of profit for the house builders would be a travesty.

Therefore this site should not be considered.

Name: Loiuise Bradley

Representor No: PRS06304

Representation ID: REP07230 Question Ref: H1

I strongly object to the proposed development of 234 houses on the above site. This is greenbelt land which should be preserved. Other sites, including brownfield sites in particular should be considered first. It would result in a loss of farming land situated within the world renowned rhubarb triangle. This development would be harmful to the character of the village which is in a rural location. There is a lack of local amenities and infrastructure and poor access to the development means it would result in a significant increase in car journeys on minor village roads.

The development is too large and would generate more children than the local schools can accommodate. Rodillians, Robin Hood Junior and Carlton Primary are already at full capacity. The doctors surgery would also be unable to cope it is already a problem to get an appointment at the surgery.

There is also insufficient infrastructure in local villages to cope with the development. The development is in a rural location and is not a sustainable development. I would also like to understand where this development has housing on three sites of the site, as, I believe, that this is factually incorrect.

I would like go be informed about the next stage of the consultation.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Kristine Steele

Representor No: PRS06372

Representation ID: REP07382 Question Ref: H1

Objecting to 3085 & 3081A

I wish to write to you to express my concerns on the Site Allocation Plan - Issues and Options information. Firstly I must say that on Monday 21st July if it had not been by chance that a person came along on Greenmoor Avenue and gave my husband the information about the future consultation for our area I would not have known anything about this Plan. I do not read the Yorkshire Evening Post, or call at the One Stop Centres but I do visit the Rothwell library and on Tuesday 22nd July I did find a small poster on the noticeboard at the back of the Douglas Barlow room. It was a poster that was easily missed and retrospect it would have been useful to have had a meeting in Lofthouse itself.

At our local PACT meeting on the evening of Monday 21st July two Leeds Councillors came and we did get the information then, but the majority of the local people at the PACT meeting said that they also had not known anything about the meetings or the consultation itself. I believe that there are still many people in the Lofthouse area who may not know about this and would have liked to have had the opportunity to express their opinions. There has only been a week to make a response in respect of the two huge plots of land that is being considered for allocation for housing, which is the Leeds and Wakefield Road site at Lofthouse (3085) and the Hope Farm site (3081A) Wakefield Road, Rothwell. I am annoyed there may be some people in the local communities who have not been properly informed of this development plan and this information should have been mailed to local homes directly who live in the areas of these sites. I do understand that Leeds City Council has a statutory duty to advertise what is happening but I am afraid the information does not always reach everybody. Everyone in the community has an equal right to be involved in making comments about future developments that may affect them. If in the future you advertise any meetings please would you kindly put details in the Wakefield Express as well as more residents in this area are likely to see it.

The land on the Leeds and Wakefield Road (3085) and bordered by Jumbles Lane and Cemetery Lane has been a field that has been used for agriculture for a very long time and would be a huge loss of farming land. I believe that this land should be preserved as it is and other brownfield sites should be considered first. The quantity of houses to be considered on both sites (3085) and (3081A) will be overbearing and is unbelievable in this area as this development would have insufficient infrastructure in the area to support it and the surrounding villages would be unable to cope with school places. Carlton Primary School, Robin Hood School and Rodillian Secondary School are at capacity and do not have spare places. There would also be insufficient infrastructure also for health facilities and recreation.

The access to the Lofthouse site(3085) is a concern and would also add extra traffic to the busy A61 especially at peak times. This site also has two crossroads one major and one minor that lie on its outer perimeter. How will residents access this site and will the development result in an increase of traffic on minor village roads too. This site is not flat as it slopes from the property next door down to Jumbles Lane and has had problems with flooding from heavy rainfall collecting at the crossroads near to Cemetery Lane. To cover this land with housing and roads will add extra rainfall water flowing down to this junction as the land would not be able to absorb it.

Previous housing developments on the A61 on the Leeds and Wakefield Road has been mostly land that lies further back from the main road and does not have a huge frontage onto the main A61 road. This housing would be more visible from the main and side roads so would be viewed on three sides and to all the surrounding residents. The site would not be in keeping with the surrounding housing and would also be overbearing where it meets an agricultural field below it on Cemetery Lane.

Are the two sites (3085) and 3081A) to be developed at the same time or are they to be staggered?

When you walk down Cemetery Lane down to Carlton or visa versa you feel as if you are walking from one village to another, with open fields, wide views, and seeing the effect of the seasons on the land. The Lofthouse site lies in the centre of the world famous Rhubarb Triangle, a rural location that adds to the rural image when visitors come to see the Rhubarb fields and view the forced rhubarb growing in the forcing sheds. The surrounding fields of crops growing is what needs to be seen not a huge field covered with boxy houses. I feel that the development will be harmful to the character of the area as the land sits in an area that still has a rural feel and if the land is on Green Belt then this should be kept as such.

I would support smaller developments of 30-35 houses, but not huge housing developments as they are not sustainable as the infrastructure is only coping at the moment. Another idea I might support for the Lofthouse site is that if it was appropriate or if there was a need for it from the community, it would be for Lofthouse to have its own Junior and Infants School and possibly a Community Centre. If there is a need for school places this would help alleviate the lack of places in this area and would give Lofthouse more of its own identity whereby the children would go to their own school in their own area. All the schools in the area are very good schools. This use of the land for a school would not be as intrusive or unattractive as

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: Kristine Steele

Representor No: PRS06372

234 modern boxy houses looking very much the same.

If both of the two sites are to be considered for housing development with a combination of 513 houses being built I feel that the community will be frustrated that the rural feel of our area will be hugely eroded and an urbanisation will be imposed on it that the local community doesn't want.

Name: Carlton Neighbourhood Association

Representor No: PRS06375

Representation ID: REP07379 Question Ref: H1

3085 suport with conditions - see submitted representation for full details.

This site is Green Belt land and its development would represent significant sprawl in relation to the size of the settlement. It is well connected to local transport links, public transport and local services.

The CVRA considers this site may be appropriate for development on a smaller scale, providing that:

- 1) The means of access is directly from Leeds Road;
- 2) Any development is only along the sides of the field adjoining Leeds Road and 1 Jumbles Lane; and
- 3) The island of trees within the field remains untouched.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07466 Question Ref: H1

3085 Disagree should be amber - see submitted representation for full details

We would question whether the assessment is correct in stating that the site is surrounded on three sides by development. Residential uses exist to the south and west but apart from a cul-de-sac at the junction of Green Lane and Cemetery Lane to the south east corner, no development exists to the eastern or northern boundaries of the site. There is no strongly defined boundary to the north.

The Site Assessment concludes that there is high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl. Furthermore the topological character of site 3085 is such that it is prominent to the north west thus the perceived impact of development sprawl and encroachment towards Carlton would be heightened. We would therefore question the overall effect on Green Belt purposes. Incorrect site area given in Site Assessment (3.91).

Representation ID: REP07891 Question Ref: H2

3085 The Grange, Leeds Road. We would question whether the assessment is correct in stating that the site is surrounded on three sides by development. Residential uses exist to the south and west but apart from a cul-de-sac at the junction of Green Lane and Cemetery Lane to the south east corner, no development exists to the eastern or northern boundaries of the site. There is no strongly defined boundary to the north. The Site Assessment concludes that there is high potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl. Furthermore the topological character of site 3085 is such that it is prominent to the north west thus the perceived impact of development sprawl and encroachment towards Carlton would be heightened. We would therefore question the overall effect on Green Belt purposes. Incorrect site area given in Site Assessment (3.91).

Name: Justin Coley

Representor No: PRS06448

Representation ID: REP07524 Question Ref: H1

SITE 3085 The Grange, 308 Leeds Road Lofthouse:

This site is Green Belt land and its development would represent significant sprawl in relation to the size of the settlement. It is well connected to local transport links, public transport and local services.

The CVRA considers this site may be appropriate for development on a smaller scale, providing that:

- 1) The means of access is directly from Leeds Road;
- 2) Any development is only along the sides of the field adjoining Leeds Road and Jumbles Lane; and
- 3) The island of trees within the field remains untouched.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3085

Housing

308 Leeds Road, WF3

Name: R Knowles

Representor No: PRS06663

Representation ID: REP07887 Question Ref: H1

Site 3085 — Disagree should be amber - see submitted representation for full details

This site has significant highway concerns and would not form a natural extension in our opinion.

The site does not have development on "three sides" as stated by the Council.

Development of this site would result in the expansion of the settlement to the north and east thus pushing the defined Green Belt boundary in such a way that is considered inappropriate.

5.10 Taking the two sites above, it is clear that the Council are seeking large sites in order to deliver a significant number of dwellings. This approach is so as to minimise the amount of public concern.

5.11 Given our position on the above sites it is clear that 3081A should be reduced by 179 dwellings in its capacity, and 3085 should be removed completely.

This would therefore result in the need to find land for at least 334 dwellings (taking the Councils figures alone).

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999

Representation ID: REP05732 Question Ref: H1

I respectfully ask that my objection to the proposed development be recorded.

The points I wish to raise in support of the objection are as follows:

Firstly the proposed site is Green Belt land and would imply a loss of farming land that is synonymous with the Rhubarb Triangle.

There is a brownfield site nearby on Thorpe Lower Lane, that should be considered first.

The development will be detrimental to the character of the village. There will be a significant increase in the amount of traffic on minor roads. The local schools cannot cope with the increase in capacity. The primary's are at capacity and Rodillian Academy is already over subscribed. As a school governor I am we'll aware of the capacities of the local schools.

The size of the development is detrimental to the area as a whole and would significantly alter the aesthetics of the surrounding villages.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3088

Housing

Westgate Lane, Lofthouse

Name: Janet Dobson

Representor No: PRS03431

Representation ID: REP01994 Question Ref: H4

1261. 3088Not suitable re access and over developmentBoth give rise to Urban Sprawl not suitable

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H4

3088 Land East of Shop Lane – this site is also in the Green Belt and is right on the boundary with Wakefield. I welcome the fact that it is not listed as Green but believe the number of houses proposed in this small settlement would have a significant impact on that community.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3093

Housing

Eshald Lane, Woodlesford

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: H7

Eshald Lane, Woodlesford. Agree that development would compromise setting of green space.

Name: Walter Morley

Representor No: PRS02877

Representation ID: REP05438 Question Ref: G10

G10/2131

This is an allotment site and should be sieved out. In Kippax there is a great demand for allotments

Name: Richard Hollinson

Representor No: PRS03384

Representation ID: REP02077 Question Ref: G10

No comment.

Name: James O'Neill

Representor No: PRS04042

Representation ID: REP00898 Question Ref: G10

With allocations being allowed in the past for the land around this area to have housing built on it, I dot see the problem with developing this area

Name: Christopher Rolph

Representor No: PRS04051

Representation ID: REP01801 Question Ref: G10

Don't know site well enough to comment

Name: Roger Downing

Representor No: PRS04229

Representation ID: REP01799 Question Ref: G10

none

Name: D.j Cove

Representor No: PRS05192

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: H7

3093 - Agree with Red

We agree with Site Allocations Plan that this site should be sieved out, given that it does not accord with the Leeds Core Strategy, in particular the settlement hierachy which guides where housing growth should be located in the district.

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS06345

Representation ID: REP07323 Question Ref: H7

3093 Agree Red see submitted representation for full details

Eshald Lane, Woodlesford. Agree that development would compromise setting of green space.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3093

Housing

Eshald Lane, Woodlesford

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07894 Question Ref: G10

Site 3093 should be formally designated as part of Eshald Wood for Natural Greenspace. There is no definable boundary between the site and the adjacent greenspace designation; they are both heavily treed thus the site contributes to the ecological value and function of Eshald Wood.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3300

Housing

Former White Hart Hotel, 40 Church Street, Woodlesford, Leeds

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: General comment

White Hart Site Built

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3318

Housing

Land off Wood Lane

Name: Richard Hollinson

Representor No: PRS03384

Representation ID: REP02077 Question Ref: G11

No comment.

Name: James O'Neill

Representor No: PRS04042

Representation ID: REP00898 Question Ref: G11

These allotments are worked on a daily basis by local people who care about the land they use and should be left to them to continue.

Name: Christopher Rolph

Representor No: PRS04051

Representation ID: REP01801 Question Ref: G11

Retained for greenspace otherwise quota of allotments would fall below par.

Name: Roger Downing

Representor No: PRS04229

Representation ID: REP01799 Question Ref: G11

none

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H7

3318

This site is considered unacceptable for development and indeed is designated as a UDP Ni (Allotments) and also identified as Allotments in the Open Space Audit. The site is productive and well tended and provides a very useful community benefits. The site is also adjacent to a school with its own sports field, combining to create a self-contained green space surrounded by existing housing settlements. We consider it is extremely important to see this site remaining as allotments and agree with the Red designation.

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07894 Question Ref: G11

Access to open spaces and opportunities for recreation and the enjoyment of wildlife make an important contribution to the health and well being of communities. This is the thrust of national policy and is reflected in the draft Core Strategy. There is only a very small surplus of allotment space in the Outer South MCA. Site 3318 would involve the loss of the entirety of Victoria Pit allotments thereby having a detrimental effect on the supply of this provision. Site 3318 should be retained as greenspace.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3444

Housing

Wood Lane Allotments, Rothwell, Leeds

Name: Richard Hollinson

Representor No: PRS03384

Representation ID: REP02077 Question Ref: G12

No comment.

Name: James O'Neill

Representor No: PRS04042

Representation ID: REP00898 Question Ref: G12

With these allotments being allowed to waste, I do not see a problem realising this land for housing

Name: Roger Downing

Representor No: PRS04229

Representation ID: REP01799 Question Ref: G12

none

Name: Peter Ellis

Representor No: PRS06332

Representation ID: REP07288 Question Ref: H7

3444 - Agree Red - see full submitted representation for details.

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07894 Question Ref: G12

Access to open spaces and opportunities for recreation and the enjoyment of wildlife make an important contribution to the health and well being of communities. This is the thrust of national policy and is reflected in the draft Core Strategy. There is only a very small surplus of allotment space in the Outer South MCA. Site 3444 would involve the loss of the entirety of Wood Lane – Reservoir Allotments thereby having a detrimental effect on the supply of this provision. It is also noted that Site 3444 scored the highest quality score of all allotment provision in the Outer South MCA in the Green Space Audit. Site 3444 should be retained as greenspace.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Susan Sanders

Representor No: PRS00024

Representation ID: REP00430 Question Ref: H4

3455A - Totally disagree as there are drainage issues from underground springs in field causing issues in winter. Also heavy speeding traffic currently which would increase and add additional risk to current residents on Water Lane / Gamble Lane and pulling off of Hare Park Mount.

Name: Brian Patterson

Representor No: PRS00083

Representation ID: REP00489 Question Ref: H4

Poor access to both sites. No local amenities to speak of. Gamble Lane can't cope with all the extra traffic this will create. Bad access off Tong Road.

Name: Lynne Patterson

Representor No: PRS00084

Representation ID: REP00490 Question Ref: H4

With poor access on to Tong Road and more traffic on to Gamble Lane, where would all the extra residents enter these sites? Congestion is an issue on the Ring Road before all this extra traffic would be created. Also it would add more pollution. There are two really bad bends on Tong Road which would interfere with entrances and exits on the two sites. Where would the alternative access be? With upwards of 700 people to be living on these sites (potentially) where are the GPs surgeries, schools and supermarkets in this area to sustain them. Where are the public transport links, there are no buses or trains around these sites, adding to the already busy roads. Gamble Lane is not made for the amount of traffic using it now without more being forced on to it because of lack of services. Where would all the extra vehicles go?

Name: Paul Smith

Representor No: PRS00129

Representation ID: REP00901 Question Ref: H4

3455A - When I bought my house 7 years ago I bought it for its semi rural and peaceful location. Not only will building spoil this, but also the wildlife will be disturbed, e.g. nesting bats, owls, foxes etc. Also cars use Gamble Lane as a cut through at the moment, so the extra volume of cars if houses were built on the field would be tremendous. The buses were diverted from Gamble Lane because of the narrowness of it.

Name: John Hardy

Representor No: PRS00192

Representation ID: REP02122 Question Ref: H4

3455A - Strongly against site for planning and sustainability reasons:- no schools- no public transport- no shopsThe number of homes proposed won't give enough contributions to pay for all these things.

Name: Lauren Kearney

Representor No: PRS00194

Representation ID: REP02124 Question Ref: H4

- 1 Land is green belt and should remain so
- 2 Land gives access to Post Hill for dog walkers, hikers, cyclists, horse riders
- 3 Buildings would spoil the beauty and countryside
- 4 Wildlife would be affected
- 5 Increased traffic causing more risk of accidents
- 6 Increased icy conditions from land development

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Andrea Holden

Representor No: PRS00206

Representation ID: REP02138 Question Ref: H4

3455A - Land is green belt and should remain so. Land gives access to Post Hill for dog walkers, hikers, cyclists, horse riders. Buildings would spoil the beauty and countryside. Wildlife would be affected. Increased traffic causing more risk of accidents. Increased icy conditions from land in winter.

Name: Jean Mackintosh

Representor No: PRS00306

Representation ID: REP02248 Question Ref: H4

3455A -

This field is on the field at the back of where we live
We have lived here for 45 years and enjoyed the quiet and peaceful area
Here again water and drainage is a big issue
Gardens flood when water drains down
And there is a public footpath at the back of gardens which leads on to post hill a nature area
Houses built here would be looking down on us encroaching on our privacy
There is also dog kennels near this field and would increase the noise levels
Please consider all these concerns when the consultation period comes to an end

Name: G Mackintosh

Representor No: PRS00307

Representation ID: REP02249 Question Ref: H4

3455A -

This field is on the field at the back of where we live
We have lived here for 45 years and enjoyed the quiet and peaceful area
Here again water and drainage is a big issue
Gardens flood when water drains down
And there is a public footpath at the back of gardens which leads on to post hill a nature area
Houses built here would be looking down on us encroaching on our privacy
There is also dog kennels near this field and would increase the noise levels
Please consider all these concerns when the consultation period comes to an end

Name: P Woodhead

Representor No: PRS00528

Representation ID: REP02477 Question Ref: H4

We are writing to object to the proposed building on green belt land. It would put extra traffic on the already busy Gamble Lane and Tong Road. Tong Road is a very fast road with speeding drivers who take little notice of the 50 speed limit sign. There have been numerous accidents on this road especially at the junction where we live. More traffic would increase this risk. Also it would spoil the landscape of this rural area, we don't want to see housing built on it. We are on the Leeds/Bradford boundary and don't want any more land eaten up by building.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Pamela Rogers

Representor No: PRS00548

Representation ID: REP02499 Question Ref: H4

3455A – Against.

- 1.Traffic
 - 2.Noise
 - 3.Light to house
 - 4.Habitat in field
 - 5.Privacy
 - 6.Green belt land
 - 7.Disruption of footpath
-

Name: Mark Rogers

Representor No: PRS00550

Representation ID: REP02501 Question Ref: H4

3455A – As a householder living on Hare Park Mount I object to the building of houses or anything else, the traffic would be intolerable, noise, our privacy would go. It is green belt land now farmers land. There is a wonderful habitat, also a footpath to Post Hill which people use for walks. A lot of light would be blocked on our house, by the new homes.

Also against –

- Traffic
- Noise
- Light to houses
- Mining and footpath
- Gas
- Privacy
- Overlooking
- Habitat in field
- Green belt land

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Jonathan Newbould

Representor No: PRS00856

Representation ID: REP07392 Question Ref: H4

Concerning site allocation plans 3455A and 3455 B, I have sent two letters during the consultation period, one last week and one two weeks ago and I am yet to receive a reply.

We, as the people that you represent, have a right to share our vies about these ridiculous plans, if you even are a democracy - and we expect replies to our letters of complaint.

I have raised a number of issues to why these sites are unsuitable, and thus I expect a reply to my letters immediately, explaining if my points have changed the plans for the sites (they should, or rather, they WILL).

I expect a reply immediately to this email, and to receive a formal letter by Friday 2nd.

PS- More evidence has come to light as to why the sites are unsuitable - in previous years the site was used temporarily to dump asbestos. It is still there, buried.

Representation ID: REP02874 Question Ref: H4

3455A -

I am writing in regard to the proposed plans of development of sites at the top of Gamble Lane, Farnley. These sites (3455A and 3455B) are NOT suitable for development, as I have explained in a previous letter, and this one — as new information has come to light.

Firstly, there are a number of natural springs underneath Gamble Lane and Water Lane, for the whole length of the street (Tong Road to Butt Lane). The amount of traffic on the street has caused cracks to emerge from the constant weight of these cars. The new housing development of 350 houses would bring a further 700 cars to the street, and this would cause irreversible damage to the road. The weight may cause the earth above the springs to collapse — causing the council to repair the road and reinforce the support of the road from more cracks that may emerge. The road cannot deal with the weight of these cars, and thus more houses on this street are implausible. The springs are making the road weak at the moment, without an extra 700 cars.

Furthermore, the top of Gamble Lane, where there are no paths was not constructed as a public road. This section of road was a dirt track, created during the Second World War for Military access only to the Post Hill Prisoner of War Camp for Italian POWs, and the Military shooting range. Thus the road is very unsuitable for housing development, as it is dangerous to pedestrians, and would only add more pressure onto your budget.

Detroit went bankrupt only recently, and they are developing old, abandoned Brownfield sites and increasing the amount of agricultural and woodland to increase the population. Leeds City Council should be doing this. Develop houses on the sites closer the city centre, which look horribly decrepit, and leave the Greenfield sites (3455a and b) alone to increase the population and economy of Leeds. The land under proposed development is the factor which sells homes, and without that, there would not be a draw to this area, causing houses to linger on the market for over a year and not sell.

PICTURE ABOVE:[Scanned]

Cracks run all the way down the street and spurt of regularly to either side of the street. These cracks are in abundance, and in places, are rather deep.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Jonathan Newbould

Representor No: PRS00856

Representation ID: REP04084 Question Ref: H4

3455A -

I am writing in regard to the proposed plans of development of sites at the top of Gamble Lane, Farnley. These sites (3455A and 3455B) are NOT suitable for development for a number of reasons, which will be explained in this letter.

Indeed, there is a need for new houses as population increases, however these sites are GREEN FILED sites, and the council should look towards BROWN FIELD sites for redevelopment. These sites are completely unsuitable for residential development, and I can assure that Councillor John Hardy and the residents of Gable Lane, Water Lane, Wood Lane and the surrounding area will put up an astounding fight to stop the plan of greedy Councillors to place 350 houses on precious and loved agricultural land.

Reasons as to why the site is completely unsuitable for development are as follows:

I. DESTRUCTION OF GREEN FIELD SITES

The sites proposed for developments (3455A and 3455B) are part of the GREEN BELT and are GREEN FIELD SITES. Rather than the Council developing Green Field Sites, they should develop Brown field sites that have fallen into disrepair. A number of Brown field sites can be found closer to the city centre, and provide an abundance of land for more houses than the proposed 350 on this Green field site. Brown fields need redevelopment more desperately, than development for monetary gain to destroy agricultural and wood land.

II. WILDLIFE DISRUPTION

The development would destroy agricultural land that is rich with wildlife. In the proposed area, there are grasshoppers, crickets, foxes, frogs, dragonflies, butterflies, rabbits, hedgehogs, squirrels, as well as a multitude of birds including the REDKITE (which is a species only recently introduced back into the country, and need to be peacefully left to breed and repopulate). Furthermore, the area is a hotspot for bats, and the trees and outbuildings in sites 3455A and 3455B are home to bats. NOBODY CAN DISTURB BATS, BY LAW.

III. SWAGE SYSTEMS

When development occurs, the new drainage system is attached onto the existing drainage system of said street. The sewage system of Gamble Lane is archaic. To my, and several other individuals' understanding, Gamble Lane's Victorian sewage system has already been added onto in the 1920s, 1930s, 1970s and 1980s. 300+ new houses would suffocate, and damage the sewage/drainage system, causing lagging and overflow. Gamble Lane's sewage system was not designed for such an intake of water and human waste. Adding onto the system, as you most certainly would do, would ruin it.

You are fools if you build 350 new houses on top of a Georgian/Victorian sewage system.

IV. TRAFFIC

Gamble Lane is a small road. It is a road that is designed only to take the traffic of the residents' cars. The road has natural springs running underneath it for the whole length, and due to the traffic existing on the road already, a large crack has formed in the middle of the road. 350 new houses means probably 700 new cars.

Gamble Lane is too small for this traffic, and so is Wood Lane, and so is Tong Road. Not only would this traffic cause damage to the actual road, but it would cause a threat to the residents of the street. These new cars would race down, causing a threat to the lives of the children playing on the street, or elderly homeowners strolling across to their neighbours homes. It is a relaxed lane, and more traffic would cost lives by people being run down by cars.

You are supposed to represent us, however letting these housing plans go ahead shows that you do not care about the people of this city, and you are in the wrong job as all you care about is money. PROVE that YOU are in the right job, and you are GOOD AT IT! Or do you not care about car crashes and child mortality rates? If you have a child or elderly parent of your own, you would not want their quiet home to be disturbed by loud traffic that may threaten their safety at home! Do something to help your people, it is your job. Otherwise, vive la revolution.

V. SCHOOL PLACES/LOCAL AMMENATIES/DOCTORS

In the area surrounding Gamble Lane, there are no local amenities. The local schools are 1.5 miles away, however the doctors are much more further away in Wortley and Pudsey. There are no shops. The sites are miles away from anywhere. Houses around this area take forever to sell, sometimes sitting on the market for even a year, unsold. These new homes will not sell, so do NOT ruin Green belt land on a whim!

VI. PUBLIC FOOTPATHS

The two sites, 3455a and 3455b encompass Public Footpaths. The National Trust suggest that paths found on maps (these are) have public right of way. One of the paths, in 3455A serves as an entrance to Post Hill Woods. You cannot destroy this pathway, as the public have a right to walk through this field. And so they shall.

Thank you for reading my letter of complaint. I hope that my views will serve helpful in this period of consultation and that they prove to sway the argument helped by the other complaints from private residents. I hope to hear from you soon.

This letter, and others sent to protest against these plans should make a huge difference to stop these plans as we live in a democracy. Leeds City Council should be a democracy, and if the views of residents are disregarded, is Leeds City Council not just a hypocritical, backwards, and corrupt Stalinist hierarchy. The Council should listen to our plea, and if they do not, they are only money grabbing bastards who are in the wrong profession as they do not care about the people they

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Jonathan Newbould

Representor No: PRS00856

are supposed to represent.

Name: Firth

Representor No: PRS00962

Representation ID: REP03003 Question Ref: H4

As a local residents, we are writing to object to the proposed development of sites 3455A Amber and 3455B Green for housing.

These are our objections:

- 1 Both sites are part of the Green Belt and have been farmed for generations.
 - 2 Wildlife on both sites will be destroyed and the footpaths would be disrupted. The footpath across site 3455A is used daily by walkers to access Post Hill.
 - 3 Both sites are elevated and new development would cause loss of privacy and loss of light.
 - 4 Gamble Lane and Tong Road already carry heavy traffic and are not suitable for the larger amount of traffic which would be created by the proposed housing.
 - 5 Gamble Lane is badly affected by water running off site 3455A. In winter the lane ices up and becomes treacherous.
-

Name: Boland

Representor No: PRS01626

Representation ID: REP03778 Question Ref: H1

3455A -

As residents of Hare park mount we feel we must stongly object to the proposed sites 3455A and 3455B being use for building development.

OUR OBJECTIONS BEING,

- 1, Both sites are classed as green belt sites that are suppose to stop the spread of urban areas, and are at present still used for farming.
 - 2, Both sites also attacked a variety of wildlife and are used as wildlife corridors, my husband has recorded around sixty different species of birds whilst we have lived here. his will certainly decline if work goes ahead.
 - 3, The sites are also enjoyed by walkers of all ages, and a path along site 3455A gives dirrect access to post hill an area that is classed as a Leeds nature area, and would be susceptible to the light pollution, noise, litter ect.
 - 4, With site 3455A being on a elivated position to Hare park mount, building work would mean a lack of privacy to these house plus cause a lack of natural light.
 - 5, Gamble lane is unsuitable for heavy traffic and more houses means more vehicles in the area.
it is also used as a rat run to get to the ring road, with most drivers doing above the speed limit.
It has also been considered to hazardous to be used by public transport companies
7 resulting in none doing so.
 - 6, Gamble lane also floods when it rain, the water running off the site 3455A which also contains natural springs, this freezes when the weather turns cold making the road hazardous to all, and more concrete and tarmac ect is going to make the situation worse.
plus when its snows Gamble lane and Tong road can both become unpassable.
 - 7, AND MOST IMPORTANT ONCE DESTROYED LEEDS WILL NEVER GET ITS GREEN SPACES BACK.
- Therefor we urge you to consider leaving the proposed sites as green belt and farmland.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: B Waud

Representor No: PRS01744

Representation ID: REP03907 Question Ref: H4

Question H4 - 3455A

Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as "amber" represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

I do not believe that this site is suitable for the following reasons:-

- Several underground springs constantly flowing from this field from several points on Hare Park Mount and Gamble Lane. If the surrounding trees/hedges and Greenland is taken away, the levels of water will increase dramatically. We personally already have issues with water to our garden and Garage. The drainage on the surrounding roads are already struggling with the water, by ways of flooding. The ice is a major concern, due to near misses in the car and also the neighbours slipping on pavements/road - if the plan for 3455B goes ahead, this will be impacted further.
- There is wildlife using this field that would be impacted if plans went ahead. (foxes, deer, bats)
- We would personally have neighbours looking straight into our window — and have no privacy what so ever, this would also increase noise levels which we currently do not have.

Representation ID: REP03907 Question Ref: H5

Question H5 - 3455A

Which sites do you disagree with and why?

I disagree for following reasons:-

- Currently the traffics levels on Gamble lane are already high this would be increase further
- Water levels in the area — would also be severely impacted and affect the local underground water system and local area i.e. reservoir, becks, local streams.
- This area is currently this is green belt and brings all the benefits of living in the countryside, whilst still being part of a bigger town. The plans would further reduce the green belt and move the towns closer together
- Invasion of privacy and increased noise pollution to those already in residence.

Being a long term neighbour of site 3455A, I am very passionate about the field remaining as it is currently. I purchased my property given the understanding that the site is green belt, farming land and was fully aware of the water issues, but wanted the country environment. I am very concerned that my privacy will be taken away, there will be an impact to local wildlife and that the area is not currently able to cope with the water and traffic issues on Gamble Lane (which has already been highlighted to the council). All of the above have to be issues have to be impacted by any change in house number in this area and can only increase risk to the current residents.

I really do hope that all concerns are taken into consideration when the consultation period comes to an end.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: C Cross

Representor No: PRS01747

Representation ID: REP03909 Question Ref: H4

Question H4 - 3455A

Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as "amber" represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

I do not believe that this site is suitable for the following reasons:-

- Several underground springs constantly flowing from this field from several points on Hare Park Mount and Gamble Lane. If the surrounding trees/hedges and Greenland is taken away, the levels of water will increase dramatically. We personally already have issues with water to our garden and Garage. The drainage on the surrounding roads are already struggling with the water, by ways of flooding. The ice is a major concern, due to near misses in the car and also the neighbours slipping on pavements/road - if the plan for 3455B goes ahead, this will be impacted further.
- There is wildlife using this field that would be impacted if plans went ahead. (foxes, deer, bats)
- We would personally have neighbours looking straight into our window — and have no privacy what so ever, this would also increase noise levels which we currently do not have.

Representation ID: REP03909 Question Ref: H5

Question H5 - 3455A

Which sites do you disagree with and why?

I disagree for following reasons:-

- Currently the traffics levels on Gamble lane are already high this would be increase further
- Water levels in the area — would also be severely impacted and affect the local underground water system and local area i.e. reservoir, becks, local streams.
- This area is currently this is green belt and brings all the benefits of living in the countryside, whilst still being part of a bigger town. The plans would further reduce the green belt and move the towns closer together
- Invasion of privacy and increased noise pollution to those already in residence.

Being a long term neighbour of site 3455A, I am very passionate about the field remaining as it is currently. I purchased my property given the understanding that the site is green belt, farming land and was fully aware of the water issues, but wanted the country environment. I am very concerned that my privacy will be taken away, there will be an impact to local wildlife and that the area is not currently able to cope with the water and traffic issues on Gamble Lane (which has already been highlighted to the council). All of the above have to be issues have to be impacted by any change in house number in this area and can only increase risk to the current residents.

I really do hope that all concerns are taken into consideration when the consultation period comes to an end.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: D Sloane

Representor No: PRS01757

Representation ID: REP03921 Question Ref: H4

Question H4 - 3455A

Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as "amber" represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

I do not believe that this site is suitable for the following reasons:-

- Several underground springs constantly flowing from this field from several points on Hare Park Mount and Gamble Lane. If the surrounding trees/hedges and Greenland is taken away, the levels of water will increase dramatically. We personally already have issues with water to our garden and Garage. The drainage on the surrounding roads are already struggling with the water, by ways of flooding. The ice is a major concern, due to near misses in the car and also the neighbours slipping on pavements/road - if the plan for 3455B goes ahead, this will be impacted further.
- There is wildlife using this field that would be impacted if plans went ahead. (foxes, deer, bats)
- We would personally have neighbours looking straight into our window — and have no privacy what so ever, this would also increase noise levels which we currently do not have.

Representation ID: REP03921 Question Ref: H5

Question H5 - 3455A

Which sites do you disagree with and why?

I disagree for following reasons:-

• Currently the traffics levels on Gamble lane are already high this would be increase further

• Water levels in the area — would also be severely impacted and affect the local underground water system and local area i.e. reservoir, becks, local streams.

• This area is currently this is green belt and brings all the benefits of living in the countryside, whilst still being part of a bigger town. The plans would further reduce the green belt and move the towns closer together

• Invasion of privacy and increased noise pollution to those already in residence.

Being a long term neighbour of site 3455A, I am very passionate about the field remaining as it is currently. I purchased my property given the understanding that the site is green belt, farming land and was fully aware of the water issues, but wanted the country environment. I am very concerned that my privacy will be taken away, there will be an impact to local wildlife and that the area is not currently able to cope with the water and traffic issues on Gamble Lane (which has already been highlighted to the council). All of the above have to be issues have to be impacted by any change in house number in this area and can only increase risk to the current residents.

I really do hope that all concerns are taken into consideration when the consultation period comes to an end.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: G Sloane

Representor No: PRS01789

Representation ID: REP03958 Question Ref: H4

Question H4 - 3455A

Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as "amber" represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

I do not believe that this site is suitable for the following reasons:-

- Several underground springs constantly flowing from this field from several points on Hare Park Mount and Gamble Lane. If the surrounding trees/hedges and Greenland is taken away, the levels of water will increase dramatically. We personally already have issues with water to our garden and Garage. The drainage on the surrounding roads are already struggling with the water, by ways of flooding. The ice is a major concern, due to near misses in the car and also the neighbours slipping on pavements/road - if the plan for 3455B goes ahead, this will be impacted further.
- There is wildlife using this field that would be impacted if plans went ahead. (foxes, deer, bats)
- We would personally have neighbours looking straight into our window — and have no privacy what so ever, this would also increase noise levels which we currently do not have.

Representation ID: REP03958 Question Ref: H5

Question H5 - 3455A

Which sites do you disagree with and why?

I disagree for following reasons:-

- Currently the traffics levels on Gamble lane are already high this would be increase further
- Water levels in the area — would also be severely impacted and affect the local underground water system and local area i.e. reservoir, becks, local streams.
- This area is currently this is green belt and brings all the benefits of living in the countryside, whilst still being part of a bigger town. The plans would further reduce the green belt and move the towns closer together
- Invasion of privacy and increased noise pollution to those already in residence.

Being a long term neighbour of site 3455A, I am very passionate about the field remaining as it is currently. I purchased my property given the understanding that the site is green belt, farming land and was fully aware of the water issues, but wanted the country environment. I am very concerned that my privacy will be taken away, there will be an impact to local wildlife and that the area is not currently able to cope with the water and traffic issues on Gamble Lane (which has already been highlighted to the council). All of the above have to be issues have to be impacted by any change in house number in this area and can only increase risk to the current residents.

I really do hope that all concerns are taken into consideration when the consultation period comes to an end.

Name: Shelia Pearson

Representor No: PRS01847

Representation ID: REP05326 Question Ref: H4

I object to this for two reasons

1. Loss of green belt/farming land
2. Increased level of traffic. Gamble Lane particularly is already a nightmare with the volume of traffic for such a narrow winding lane

I object to this on the same grounds as question 1. Even if Access is directed somehow through Wood Grove to Wood Lane, that also is already horrendously busy for the size of Road

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Graham Dodds

Representor No: PRS02654

Representation ID: REP05101 Question Ref: H4

3455A Amber to Red.

Having lived at this address for 13 years moving only from next-door no35 after 15yrs. I would strongly contest your proposals to build housing on the greenbelt site at the rear of my property as the rural outlook is one of the main reasons I did not move out of the street. All residents respect and enjoy the countryside on our doorstep and will be very much against your plans. If your plans were successful you would be responsible for ridding the area of wildlife and much of what is left in the area in the way of countryside. The area would be over commercialised and the traffic hazardous.

Representation ID: REP00379 Question Ref: G1

I very much have objection to any of the plans to delete or alter boundaries or greenspace in this area. the areas of greenbelt you are proposing to delete for housing are home to wildlife bats birds foxes and is small part of famley that remains unspoilt, and allows us a little bit of countryside which I and all our neighbours truly value and appreciate as we live on the border of your plan sites 34455a and 3455b.i also would like to point out that I have lived in hare park munt 27yrs.i was refused planning permission twice if you check .I still have the documents.you refused planning saying that my plans for loft conversion would result in an alien and incongruous feature however it wouldn't have been seen by anyone as was farmland and not overlooked by anyone. I believe your new plans for this greenbelt land to be visually intrusive to me and my family and also all residents who are campaigning to keep this land as it is.

Name: Jeanette Dodds

Representor No: PRS02655

Representation ID: REP05102 Question Ref: H4

3455A

My husband has submitted an email response regarding your proposals for the site for housing. I wish to strongly agree with all his comments regarding this. I find your proposals totally unacceptable and urge you to find sites that do not eradicate the greenbelt areas that we have left in Farley. This site is right behind my house and I strongly object to your proposals to build housing that will be an invasion of privacy on my home. If houses were built here I would insist that no windows overlook my property. There are plenty of other places you could build your houses i.e. gypsy sites and old warehouse sites Brown not green belt areas.

Name: Priestley

Representor No: PRS02983

Representation ID: REP05552 Question Ref: H4

[x]

Sent: 24 July 2013 10:46
To: Department of Planning

[x]

Dear Sir or Madam,

We have been contacted by [x] concerning site allocations 3455a and 3455b which propose the building of 170 new houses on either side of Gamble Lane. [x] is vehemently against these proposals and I would be grateful if you could provide me with an update regarding the applications current status.

Thank you for your help.

Kind regards,

[x]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Mrs MCGOUGH

Representor No: PRS02988

Representation ID: REP05556 Question Ref: H4

I write in connection with the ongoing consultation about land on two sides off Gamble Lane 3455A Amber and 3455B Green. I have examined the plans and I know the sites well and wish to object strongly to any proposed housing development on these green belt sites.

To your questions H1 NO

H2 NO 3455B

H4 NO

H5 NO 3455A

The following points are my objections for the proposed development of both sites:

- The loss of a great tract of green belt and farmland.
- The impact on wild life in the fields, hedges and on nearby Post Hill.
- The disruption of local footpaths. The footpath across 3455A is used daily by many dog walkers to reach Post Hill.
- The loss of a natural break between nearby communities, creating an ugly urban sprawl.
- Site 3455A is elevated and housing would overlook existing properties, causing loss of privacy, daylight, sunlight and cause light pollution.
- Site 3455A is called Spring Park. It produces great amounts of water running down Gamble Lane, specially after wet weather. In winter it freezes, to cause dangerous road conditions.

Traffic is already heavy on Tong Road and particularly down Gamble Lane. These roads would come under further pressure from traffic the proposed development for 340 houses would create.

Both sites maybe unstable to build on due to historic mine workings.

In conclusion, I would like to urge the Council to utilise existing brown field sites first, before taking another slice of irreplaceable green belt land!

Name: Dorothy Ward

Representor No: PRS02989

Representation ID: REP05558 Question Ref: H4

[x]

Sent: 09 July 2013 16:25

To: LDF Leeds

Subject: site allocations 3455a/3455B

[x]

Dear Sirs

I would like to object to the above sites to be used for housing.

Where these are located is a small, rural site at the top of a narrow country lane with no footpaths or lighting and a bad blind bend near the site 3455a.

Access to these sites would be on to Tong Road which would be dangerous as the traffic travels fast down there and I believe that it would force them to use Gamble Lane instead, which is already a rat run and was not built for the amount of vehicles that use it now.

Gamble lane has a national speed limit on it which the motorists ignore so more traffic would be a nightmare for us residents who already have to run the gambit of these drivers.

Where are all the schools for the extra children to go to? There are no doctors or dentists in the area, no supermarkets and no public transport services. There are no amenities whatsoever.

Site 3455B has a very steep slope which has a tendency to flood at the bottom, it also is a good wildlife habitat. Where are they to go if these houses were built?

There have been houses for sale in this area which have been taken off the market because they have not sold so why do we need more

houses here? There are areas of Leeds with houses that have been boarded up, why can't these be used. I think that money spent on these would be a good investment instead of building new houses on greenbelt/greenfield land. Why not use brownfield sites instead?

Yours faithfully

[x]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Sean Walker

Representor No: PRS03185

Representation ID: REP01372 Question Ref: H4

Farnley 3455A Field at the back of Castle Ings New Farnley Leeds 12. My house has this field at the rear and at the front is a single carriageway private road. How on earth could reasonable access be available when access to the footpath that runs from Whitehall road across Castle Ings is by a ginnel at both ends. Whenever neighbours have visitors the road is congested enough without a road being built to access the field. This would mean any access from Whitehall Road that houses would have to be demolished etc. Not only that but drainage on the land is extremely poor and I am sure that joining part of that field is a small wetland conservation area. [x]

Representation ID: REP01372 Question Ref: General comment

Field at the back of Castle Ings New Farnley Leeds 12. My house has this field at the rear and at the front is a single carriageway private road. How on earth could reasonable access be available when access to the footpath that runs from Whitehall road across Castle Ings is by a ginnel at both ends. Whenever neighbours have visitors the road is congested enough without a road being built to access the field. This would mean any access from Whitehall Road that houses would have to be demolished etc. Not only that but drainage on the land is extremely poor and I am sure that joining part of that field is a small wetland conservati area. [x]

Representation ID: REP01372 Question Ref: H2

Field at the back of Castle Ings New Farnley Leeds 12. My house has this field at the rear and at the front is a single carriageway private road. How on earth could reasonable access be available when access to the footpath that runs from Whitehall road across Castle Ings is by a ginnel at both ends. Whenever neighbours have visitors the road is congested enough without a road being built to access the field. This would mean any access from Whitehall Road that houses would have to be demolished etc. Not only that but drainage on the land is extremely poor and I am sure that joining part of that field is a small wetland conservon area [x]

Name: David Pearson

Representor No: PRS03242

Representation ID: REP00966 Question Ref: H2

The site at the top of Gamble Lane (Leeds 12).The traffic in this area is already a cause for concern and further development in this area would only exacerbate the situation

Name: Ruth Robson

Representor No: PRS03389

Representation ID: REP00024 Question Ref: H3

Yes. Site amber 2123, area 456 and site 3455A. These sites would round off the existing housing area with using up valuable and limited green field sites. In addition, the area of land bounded by Walsh Lane, Low Moor Side Lane, Whitehall Rd. and the wooded area to west which is a weed strewn, over-grazed and neglected for as long as I can remember should be given green coloured site status. Ownership of the site is unknown to me. The woodland to the west of the site is in my ownership and this woodland supported by Woodland Trust would act as a buffer to the hamlet of Upper Moor Side.

Name: Denise Campbell

Representor No: PRS03643

Representation ID: REP01017 Question Ref: H5

H5 – Site 3455A(i) The area is called Park Spring for a reason. During periods of heavy/prolonged rain excessive surface water runs from this site down Gamble Lane. Development and the associated hard landscaping would exacerbate this.ii) See iv at H2iii) The site is approximately 20m above the properties on Hare Park Mount and development could raise a number of issues including Overlooking, Loss of daylight/sunlight/moonlight, Light pollution

Representation ID: REP01017 Question Ref: H2

H2 – Site 3455B(Reason) SW aspect of site in Coal Referral Area. - Ref. SHLAA Update 2012 Full Report Part 2ii) Site identified as having significant risk of contamination. – Ref. Groundsure Report dated 20/08/2013 (see attached document)iii) Natural watercourse on the steeply sloping NW boundary of the site where abutting the rear gardens of Gamble Lane. This causes the rear garden of 63 Gamble Lane (and possibly others) to waterlog during periods of heavy and/or prolonged rain. This watercourse is culverted via the main drain in Water Lane to the Farnley Valley Balancing Reservoir. This reservoir was built to prevent the beck flooding in Wortley. Development of this site and the associated hard landscaping will only increase surface water run off to this watercourse.iv) Development of this site would create a new vehicular corridor from Tong Road to Gamble Lane and would also provide access to Site 3455A (Amber). Gamble Lane is already used as a shortcut from Tong Road. If one (170 housing units) or both (340 housing units) sites were developed the associated increase in traffic would create a significant risk of noise pollution to the residents of Gamble Lane/Wood Lane/Water Lane and make Gamble Lane/Wood Lane/Water Lane an unsafe environment.v) The site is approximately 15m above the rear of the properties on Gamble Lane and development could raise a number of issues including Overlooking, Loss of daylight/sunlight/moonlight Light pollution

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Joanne Mitchell

Representor No: PRS03683

Representation ID: REP01597 Question Ref: H4

Site 3455A is unsuitable for all the reasons provided for 3455B with the added problem of poor and dangerous site access.

Name: Rebecca Cumberworth

Representor No: PRS04070

Representation ID: REP00780 Question Ref: H4

Again, many sites are green belt. I strongly disagree with the development of green belt until all brown sites have been used. I strongly disagree with the core strategy for future development of Leeds – I don't agree that every wedge of Leeds should have some development occur within it when this means that brown sites remain unused in some parts of the city whilst in other wedges, green belt is being reclassified and built on. This strategy is immoral and abhorrent and shows no regard for our natural environment / sustainability.

Representation ID: REP00780 Question Ref: H5

Reasons site 3455a not suitable for housing development:-there is a heavily used public footpath through the site which provides access to Post Hill conservation area-the site provides natural habitat and feeding ground for rare and declining species including (but not limited to) red kites, hedgehogs, brown hares, bees and foxes-the site is not near a town / village centre and public transport links are poor – the nearest train station is several miles away and buses are infrequent-developing the site would undoubtedly increase traffic on Gamble Lane which has already been identified by local residents as hazardous due to current speed and frequency of vehicles that use it-the site is used by many local residents for exercising dogs; if the site is developed, dog owners will have to find an alternate location to exercise their dogs. The less responsible owners will have low inclination to do this, which would result in an increase in bored, frustrated and potentially aggressive dogs in the area. This could result in injury to other pets, livestock and people.-The site is green belt. I strongly disagree with the development of green belt until all brown sites have been used. I strongly disagree with the core strategy for future development of Leeds – I don't agree that every wedge of Leeds should have some development occur within it when this means that brown sites remain unused in some parts of the city whilst in other wedges, green belt is being reclassified and built on. This strategy is immoral and abhorrent and shows no regard for our natural environment / sustainability.-This Green Belt site is serving a number of important functions as intended. It checks sprawl into neighbouring countryside – develop this site and the adjacent field will be next. Develop that and the fields across Tong Road will be next. And so on. I do not agree that the site has 2+ boundaries with existing built up area. It is bordered on one side by a small country lane, across which are more fields – I don't think this should classify as 'built up area'; on another side, it borders Post Hill woods; and on another it directly borders a field. The housing that borders the remaining side only goes about 50% of the way up the side – the other 50% borders a perilously steep sloping bank.-The site safeguards the small amount of remaining countryside in the area from encroachment. The site itself is regarded by existing residents as countryside and it also provides access to Post Hill. It also contains a significant number of trees and hedgerows.-The site slopes significantly and there are historical problems with water drainage

Name: Charles Middleton

Representor No: PRS04270

Representation ID: REP00698 Question Ref: H1

THE AREA AS BEEN FARM LAND/GRASSING FOR HUNDREDS OF YEARS AND THE SURROUNDING ROADS ARE NOT UP TO A STANDARD THAT WILL ACCOMODATE EXTRA TRAFFIC AND IN MY OPINION WILL INCREASE THE RISK OF ACCIDENTS OR EVEN DEATHS IN THE SURROUNDING AREAS.FLOODING AS ALSO BEEN AN ISSUE TO OUR REAR GARDENS AND I AM SURE FURTHER HARD STANDINGS ON A PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WILL INCREASE THE RISK OF FLOODING.AS THE AREA INDICATED IS CALLED PARK SPRINGS AND THIS DOES MEAN MARSH LAND ANIMALS AND MAMMALS ARE PRESENT IN THE AREA INCLUDING NEWTS FROGS AND TOADS AND THE FIELD DIRECTLY BEHIND MY PROPERTY IS KNOWN LOCALLY AS BLUE BELL HILL AND DOES HAVE BLUE BELLS GROWING THERE AND ALSO OAK TREES ALONG WITH A MEDEVIL HEDGE ROW THAT HOSTS DIFFERING SPECIES OF BATS, IN MY OPINION THE AREA SHOULD BE DESIGNATED AT A SSSI AND IT WOULD BE A TRAVESTY TO BUILD ANY THING OTHER THAN FARM RELATED BUILDINGS IN THE AREA.I AM ALSO CONCERNED THAT A LARGE AREA BEHIND THE MAISONNETTES AT THE GAMBLE LANE END OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WAS USED TO TIP CONTAMINATED WASTE DURING THE LATE 50'S AND EARLY 60'S, MY CONCERNS ARE THAT THE CAPPED OFF AREA'S WOULD BE DISTURBED AND AGAIN BE DISSASTEROUS TO THE ENVIRONMENT.I HAVE LIVED ON TONG DRIVE SINCE 1964 AND HAVE MORE LOCAL KNOLEDGE THAN MOST PEOPLE AND WOULD BE HORIFIED TO SEE ANY HOUSES BUILT ON A GREEN AREA OF BEUTY.YOURS CONCERNED CHARLES MIDDLETON.

Representation ID: REP00698 Question Ref: H2

THE SITE REFERANCE IS 3455B AND 3455A AND REASONS ARE AS ABOVE

Name: Ryszard Gorazda

Representor No: PRS04404

Representation ID: REP00225 Question Ref: H1

The sites identified (3455A&B) are not sustainable in planning terms and therefore will impact on existing houses and schools.

Representation ID: REP00225 Question Ref: H2

3455A 3455B - these are farms

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Melanie Harries

Representor No: PRS04590

Representation ID: REP00278 Question Ref: H14

The greenfield sites that I have commented on are not appropriate for elderly housing accommodation as they are not near amenities.

Representation ID: REP00278 Question Ref: H2

I disagree with Gamble Lane 3455A and 3455B planning requests for reasons stated above and also the traffic that uses Gamble Lane as a short cut is noisy and dangerous for children, this will increase vastly with the amount of houses that are proposed to be built. The amount of water that travels down Gamble Lane will increase as the trees and fields allow this to flow at a slower rate than if they were taken away, this would make the road treacherous in winter when the roads ice up. The greenfield sites make this a quieter place than most this close to the city centre, apart from the extra traffic we now get, and to take more green land away from Leeds would be a great shame.

Name: Andrew Wiggins

Representor No: PRS04622

Representation ID: REP00782 Question Ref: H4

Many amber sites are green belt. I strongly disagree with the development of green belt until all brown sites have been used. I strongly disagree with the core strategy for future development of Leeds – I don't agree that every wedge of Leeds should have some development occur within it when this means that brown sites remain unused in some parts of the city whilst in other wedges, green belt is being reclassified and built on. This strategy is immoral and abhorrent and shows no regard for our natural environment / sustainability.

Representation ID: REP00782 Question Ref: H5

Reasons site 3455a not suitable for housing development:-there is a heavily used public footpath through the site which provides access to Post Hill conservation area-the site provides natural habitat and feeding ground for rare and declining species including (but not limited to) red kites, hedgehogs, brown hares, bees and foxes-the site is not near a town / village centre and public transport links are poor – the nearest train station is several miles away and buses are infrequent-developing the site would undoubtedly increase traffic on Gamble Lane which has already been identified by local residents as hazardous due to current speed and frequency of vehicles that use it-the site is used by many local residents for exercising dogs; if the site is developed, dog owners will have to find an alternate location to exercise their dogs. The less responsible owners will have low inclination to do this, which would result in an increase in bored, frustrated and potentially aggressive dogs in the area. This could result in injury to other pets, livestock and people.-The site is green belt. I strongly disagree with the development of green belt until all brown sites have been used. I strongly disagree with the core strategy for future development of Leeds – I don't agree that every wedge of Leeds should have some development occur within it when this means that brown sites remain unused in some parts of the city whilst in other wedges, green belt is being reclassified and built on. This strategy is immoral and abhorrent and shows no regard for our natural environment / sustainability.-This Green Belt site is serving a number of important functions as intended. It checks sprawl into neighbouring countryside – develop this site and the adjacent field will be next. Develop that and the fields across Tong Road will be next. And so on. I do not agree that the site has 2+ boundaries with existing built up area. It is bordered on one side by a small country lane, across which are more fields – I don't think this should classify as 'built up area'; on another side, it borders Post Hill woods; and on another it directly borders a field. The housing that borders the remaining side only goes about 50% of the way up the side – the other 50% borders a perilously steep sloping bank.-The site safeguards the small amount of remaining countryside in the area from encroachment. The site itself is regarded by existing residents as countryside and it also provides access to Post Hill. It also contains a significant number of trees and hedgerows.-The site slopes significantly and there are historical problems with water drainage

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: John Barker

Representor No: PRS04721

Representation ID: REP01291 Question Ref: H1

These sites to my knowledge are green belt sites. I feel the council should explore the possibility of developing or re-developing brown field sites prior to developing on green-belt. Not only are their environmental issues to consider, the disruption to wildlife etc. There is also an increased risk to localised flooding if fields are developed over. The council already spend millions on flood defenses, developing on these fields will surely only increase these costs. These sites are also part of the Leeds Country Walks, so there are issues around public rights and access, as well as the health of the city, as its residents will have reduced areas to walk and exercise. Why doesn't the council consider re-developing the 14,300 empty homes across Leeds rather than just building new ones?

Representation ID: REP01291 Question Ref: H4

Site 3455A should be a red site which should not be developed for the reasons stated in H2. Environmental issues, developing on green belt, local flood risks, privacy issues, access to the sites is total inappropriate and that these sites are part of the Leeds Country Walks and are public access and rights of way.

Representation ID: REP01291 Question Ref: H12

No, the sites 3455A and 3455B are both totally inappropriate to develop in any capacity, especially for traveller sites due to access, the fact that these sites are public rights of way as well as the privacy issues previously stated as these sites over look and look onto current houses.

Representation ID: REP01291 Question Ref: H2

3455A and 3455B - I disagree with developing on these sites for the reasons already stated above. As these are green belt, the impact to local wildlife, the fact that developing on these fields will increase the risk of localised flooding, which Leeds City Council already spend millions on preventing. Both of these sites are also part of the Leeds Country Way and are public rights of way. Developing over these sites and reducing the number of areas for the cities residents to exercise and keep healthy. There are also privacy issues with these sites, especially site 3455A, as the field over looks the back of the houses on Hare Park Mount, and will look directly into residents property, including their bedrooms. The access these sites, especially 3455A is totally not appropriate. The access to site 3455A is narrow, winding and steep county road, totally inappropriate for a housing development.

Name: Matthew Russell

Representor No: PRS04853

Representation ID: REP00638 Question Ref: H2

3455B and 3455A. As above, in particular 3455a as the the land specified directly overlooks our property and on the basis the area is a public walk way

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: John Baron

Representor No: PRS04914

Representation ID: REP06044 Question Ref: H4

I am writing to you to express concern about a potential threat to the Green Belt in Farnley and Wortley Ward.

As part of Leeds City Council's Your City Your Say consultation to identify new housing and employment land, I was concerned to see that a farmer's field off Gamble Lane and behind Hare Park Mount had been earmarked for potential housing. This is application 3455a.

I have a number of concerns about this.

Firstly it's the loss of beautiful and important greenbelt land, secondly the field is on a considerable slope and any housing development would overlook properties on Hare Park Mount and thirdly - and most importantly - the access down a narrow unlit country lane (ie the top half of Gamble Lane) is entirely inappropriate and inadequate.

We already have concerns about the speed of traffic coming down Gamble Lane, without adding more traffic to exacerbate this problem..

I'd also be concerned about the loss of wildlife hedges in the area. I regularly see bats in the field on an evening. The added noise coming from a new development would spoil what is currently a tranquil cul de sac.

Directly opposite on the other side of Gamble Lane lies a farmer's house and surrounding fields. This is proposed site 3455b.

Again, it's on greenbelt land, would have poor access on Gamble Lane and would also have access issues if its access was off the busy Tong Road. Interestingly a road through this site could give access to 3455a.

With both these proposed sites I feel there is insufficient access to public transport, shops, schools and services. I fear the local infrastructure is insufficient to cope.

Hare Park Mount residents are already talking about holding a public meeting to discuss these issues.

I do hope you'll be able to support my concerns over these proposals and that the residents of Hare Park Mount and the lower half of Gamble Lane can rely on your support in proposing allocating this land for housing?

I attach a photograph of site 3455a for your reference. Hare Park Mount is on the left of the photo.

Cllr John Hardy has also said he has concerns regarding the development of the sites.

Representation ID: REP00048 Question Ref: H12

NOT 3455a or 3455b due to access and infrastructure issues highlighted previously

Name: Trustees Of Brick Mill Estate

Representor No: PRS04950

Representation ID: REP06575 Question Ref: H4

Jones Lang LaSalle considers some sites are less suitable for Green Belt release than the land at Roker Lane site.

Reason why our site is comparable/better

3455A - Some potential for further sprawl to the adjoining field. Access only through site 3455B.

Name: Denise Mcdonald

Representor No: PRS05024

Representation ID: REP05590 Question Ref: H4

3445A/3455B

1. This is GREEN BELT LAND we do not require further housing we are getting to a point where there will be nothing left for future generations not to mention the wild life which is there. It will be a concrete getto also crime figures will go up.

2. The roads that already there are not maintained. Excess water from the land causes us flooding how that would be solved.

3. How would the traffic be monitored we have problems now. They come up Gamble Lane at 70-80 MPH discussion in the past have amounted to nothing.

Name: Ian Tempest Mitchell

Representor No: PRS05025

Representation ID: REP05591 Question Ref: H4

3455A/3455B

Traffic/council unable to do anything regarding speeds too much traffic. Excess water from land, causing flooding down Gamble Lane causing untold damage to existing properties.

This is GREEN BELT LAND we do not require more housing spoiling views and wildlife we are getting to a point where there will be nothing left for future generations.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Kirsty Clayton

Representor No: PRS05041

Representation ID: REP05608 Question Ref: H4

H1- I do not believe that the site is suitable for future housing developments. The reasons for this are:

Water/drainage – currently not managing to take normal rain water, once trees are removed from the site water levels will increase. Underground springs are already a problem in the area.

The area is very 'country' at present with minimum noise levels. The development would cause a lot of noise and also spoil the current 'country setting' we live in.

H2- I disagree for the following reasons:

There will be no privacy to the residents in Hare Park Mount as the properties would be overlooked.

Traffic would increase in the area, currently speed limits have been put in place.

I bought my house on the basis that I live in Green Belt area with the feel of the country around. I feel building in this area will change the setting impacting on nature, wildlife etc.

Name: Joan Green

Representor No: PRS05428

Representation ID: REP06034 Question Ref: H4

I disagree for following reasons:-

Currently the traffic levels on Gamble lane are already high, we have had a number of accidents pulling off the drive, the risk of this will be increased if plans of 340 extra houses go ahead.

Currently this is green belt land, and brings all the benefits (bats, foxes, deer, herons, water life) which will all be lost if the plans go ahead

We purchased this house on the basis that it was a high risk area due to the gas's/tip/water - etc and were advised that due to the tip, building would never happen. This is a major concern, what will be the impact be to us if the plans go ahead with gas's etc.

Invasion of privacy and increased noise pollution to those already in residence, who purchased to live in "green belt areas"

Representation ID: REP06034 Question Ref: H4

I do not believe that this site is suitable for the following reasons:-

There is an underground stream (constant water flow) currently flowing from this field. The water drainage from the fields is excessive. If the fields/trees are not there, this WILL increase water to Water Lane/Gamble Lane. The drainage on these roads are already at capacity, and water runs above land creating issues in particular ice in winter periods, increasing chances of accidents to drivers/pedestrians/current residents - if the plan for 3455B goes ahead, this will double. Houses on Water Lane already have water draining into drives/gardens. This will again increase water flow.

There is wildlife using this in this field that would be impacted if plans went ahead. (foxes, rabbits, deer, bats)

Representation ID: REP06034 Question Ref: H4

I disagree for following reasons:-

Currently the traffic levels on Gamble lane are already high, we have had a number of accidents pulling off the drive, the risk of this will be increased if plans of 340 extra houses go ahead.

Currently this is green belt land, and brings all the benefits (bats, foxes, deer, herons, water life) which will all be lost if the plans go ahead

Invasion of privacy and increased noise pollution to those already in residence.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Barratt & David Wilson Homes Yorkshire West

Representor No: PRS05643

Representation ID: REP06767 Question Ref: H4

3455A

We support the rating of site reference 3455B as Green (sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing). However we object to the rating of site reference 3455A as Amber (sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as Green sites). We believe both sites 3455A and 3455B should be collectively allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

Conclusions

The promotional document submitted to Leeds City Council in February 2013 is attached [see original rep]. This includes a Masterplan which has an indicative capacity for over 230 dwellings, including open space and links to the open countryside. There are no major physical constraints on either site and the development of the two sites could deliver a range of benefits:

- 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

The sites have strong links to the urban area and are well contained by physical and natural features. Both sites are ideal candidates for allocation as their release would have a limited impact on Green Belt purposes, are in a sustainable location and in an area where the Council is encouraging growth. Farnley is in the Outer West housing market area which has a housing requirement of 4,700 dwellings and is within the Main Urban Area which is expected to accommodate 33,300 dwellings. The sites are close to bus stops which provide regular services into Leeds city centre. The sites are also well located in relation to local shops and services, schools and health facilities. 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 of 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 we support the housing allocation of this site and consider that it should all be given a 'Green' rating.

Site 3455B is a greenfield site, between Gamble Lane, Tong Road and Tong Drive. Included within the site, but not within the control of Barratt Homes is Mount Pleasant which are a small collection of farm buildings and farm house. To the north and south of the site is further agricultural land, and residential development off Tong Drive immediately abuts the site to the east.

Site 3455A is a sloping, greenfield site. It is bounded to the south by Gamble Lane, west and north by field boundaries and east by residential development on Hare Park Mount.

Both sites are currently designated as Green Belt and as a Special Landscape Area and Urban Fringe Priority Area in the Leeds UDP Review 2006. Both sites are on the western edge of the built up area of Farnley which lies within the Main Urban Area. In terms of local services, there are a range of services near the site. This includes a Sainsburys Local, Lloyds Pharmacy and Fish and Chip shop, 800m away at the Tong Road and Ring Road Junction. There is also a Post Office, convenience store, hairdressers, betting shop and takeaways 750m away at the roundabout between Henconner Lane and Pudsey Road. The closest large supermarket to the sites is Morrisons, 1.3km away on Swinnow Road followed by Tesco on Upper Town Street 2.3km away and ASDA at the Owlcoates Centre, 2.9km away. The site is near to public transport, education and health facilities. The site is approximately 1.5km away from Bramley Train Station where there are regular services to Leeds, Bradford, Huddersfield and Manchester Victoria. There are bus stops on Water Lane, approximately 400m from the sites where the hourly Number 80 service can be accessed, which is the Old Farnley to Bramley Shopping Centre Circular. There are also bus stops on Butt Lane and Farnley Ring Road approximately 600m from the site where the following bus services can be accessed:

- 5 – Halton Moor to Old Farnley via Leeds every 20 minutes
- 62 – Cross Green to Greengates via Saxton Gardens, Leeds, Armley and Pudsey every 30 minutes
- 711 – Bradford to the White Rose Centre via Old Farnley, Wortley and Pudsey every hour

The site is near local educational facilities. The nearest primary schools are Ryecroft Primary School which is 800m from the sites, Park Spring Primary School which is 880m away and Greenhill Primary School which is 890m away. The nearest secondary schools are The Farnley Academy which is 1.2km away, Swallow Hill Community College which is 1.7km away and Crawshaw School which is 1.7km away in nearby Pudsey. The site is also near to local health facilities. The closest GPs to the sites are Beach Tree Medical Centre on Henconner Lane, a distance of 750m away, The Gables Surgery on Swinnow Road, 1.6km away and Highfield Medical Centre on Highfield Road, 1.7km away. The two closest dental surgeries are Xen Smiles Limited, 720m away and Bramley Dental Care, 1.5km away. There are a number of pharmacies and opticians near the sites, the closest pharmacy being 760m away on Tong Road and opticians 2.3km away in Bramley.

Policy

The allocation of site 3455 for housing development is consistent with the adopted National Planning Policy Framework. The objectives of the Framework include building a strong, competitive economy, promoting sustainable transport and delivering a wide choice of high quality homes. The development at Gamble Lane is consistent with these objectives. The National Planning Policy Framework states at Paragraph 80 that the Green Belt serves five purposes. The table below assesses this site in relation to these purposes:

To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas: Both sites (A and B) are well connected to the built up area and the eastern boundary of both sites is residential. Development of this site would not lead to ribbon development and would not result in isolated development. Development of these sites would round off the western edge of Farnley.

Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another: Development of site 3455B would not lead to neighbouring towns merging into one another as it is bounded by Gamble Lane, Tong Road and residential development. Development of site 3455A would not lead to inappropriate merging of neighbouring towns given the potential for this site to include a strong landscape buffer to the west to form a defensible Green Belt boundary.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Barratt & David Wilson Homes Yorkshire West

Representor No: PRS05643

To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment: The development of this land to the north 3455A and south 3455B of Gamble Lane offers the potential to create a defensible Green Belt boundary, bound by existing roads and a strong landscape buffer. The development of the site offers opportunities to the wider community with additional pedestrian links to the open countryside to the west.

To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns: Sites A and B are not within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature. Development of both sites would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features.

To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land: Spatial Policy 1 of the Core Strategy advises that an appropriate balance of greenfield and brownfield land will be necessary to deliver the spatial development strategy. There are a few derelict and brownfield sites within the Outer West Market Area; therefore the development of greenfield sites will be necessary in order to meet the housing requirement in the draft Core Strategy.

Core Strategy Spatial Policy 6 The Housing Requirement and Allocation of Housing Land sets out that the allocation of housing land is based on criteria such as sustainable locations which meet the standards of public transport accessibility, the least impact on Green Belt purposes and avoiding areas of flood risk. The development of this site accords with this draft policy. Both sites are on the edge of the Leeds Bradford Corridor Regeneration Priority Area as defined in the draft Core Strategy. Focus is placed upon opportunities for growth within Regeneration Priority Areas as set out in Spatial Policy 4. The Leeds Bradford Corridor aims to release the economic potential of the area to the west of Leeds city centre and achieve better transport connections between the two cities. This programme is to focus on four key areas:- housing, improvement, improved food, cycle, rail and road access, improvements to green infrastructure, and increased business competitiveness and growth. The development of both sites would provide investment in the area, deliver a proposition of affordable housing and new greenspace.

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 (5%) as extensions. The housing distribution by housing market characteristic area for the Outer West is 4,700 which is 7% of the total housing requirement for the Leeds district. Given the emphasis on development in or on the edge of the Main Urban Area it can be expected that this site, on the edge of the Main Urban Area, and close to facilities performs well against this policy and should be allocated to meet help meet the housing requirement in this housing market area. In the Outer West housing market area the Draft Core Strategy apportions 4,700 dwellings as being required throughout the plan period. Regardless of our objections to the overall housing requirement, the Outer West has outstanding permissions and allocations equating to 1,728 dwellings, this is only 37% of the requirement. The total number of 'Green' sites in this housing market area has a capacity for 1,705 dwellings, some 36% of the requirement. Based on this it is clear that the Council will have to allocate all of the identified sites in the Outer West housing market area in order to achieve the dwelling requirement. The Allocations draft document identifies Amber sites with a capacity of 1,860 dwellings. Based on the draft apportioned requirement to this housing market area, over 68% of the identified Amber sites will be required in order to meet the requirement. It would be logical to include complete site 3455 as a Green, suitable site, rather than splitting the site into A and B.

In the Leeds City Council Site Assessment, reference is made to the site 3455A's transport issues and distance from local services. It states that the site has no public transport or local services within walking distance. The LCC standard is that sites should be within a 5 min walk to a bus stop offering a direct 15 min frequency service. In reality, this site is within walking distance to bus services, it being within 400m of bus stops on Water Lane and within 600m of bus stops on Butt Lane and Farnley Ring Road. Furthermore, the development of this site offers the potential to create additional bus services to further improve the accessibility of the site. LCC also score the site negatively in terms of access on the grounds of Gamble Lane being a narrow country road with no footways or lighting, and trees or stone walling on both sides, therefore making it unsuitable for access. The developer is proposing to change the current road layout of Gamble Lane. This will require drivers to drive through the development and integrate both sites into the existing built up area. The positive elements that the Council reference relate to the area being well contained by woodland with strong links to the urban area. This will be further improved by the road layout alterations.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Julie Parker

Representor No: PRS05900

Representation ID: REP06649 Question Ref: H4

3455A

I am writing to submit my opposition to the site allocation plans for sites 3455A & 3455B, which are currently open for consultation. I do not believe that this site is suitable for the following reasons:-

- Several underground springs constantly flowing from this field from several points on Hare Park Mount and Gamble Lane. If the surrounding trees/hedges and Greenland is taken away, the levels of water will increase dramatically.
- The drainage on the surrounding roads are already struggling with the water, by ways of flooding. The ice is a major concern, due to near misses in the car and also the neighbours slipping on pavements/road - if the plan for 3455B goes ahead, this will be impacted further.
- There is wildlife using this field that would be impacted if plans went ahead. (foxes, deer, bats)
- We would personally have neighbours looking straight into our window – and have no privacy what so ever, this would also increase noise levels which we currently do not have.

Representation ID: REP06649 Question Ref: H5

3455A

I disagree for following reasons:-

- Currently the traffics levels on Gamble lane are already high this would be increase further
- Water levels in the area – would also be severely impacted and affect the local underground water system and local area i.e. reservoir, becks, local streams.
- This area is currently this is green belt and brings all the benefits of living in the countryside, whilst still being part of a bigger town. The plans would further reduce the green belt and move the towns closer together
- Invasion of privacy and increased noise pollution to those already in residence.

Being a long term neighbour of site 3455A, I am very passionate about the field remaining as it is currently. I purchased my property given the understanding that the site is green belt, farming land and was fully aware of the water issues, but wanted the country environment.

I am very concerned that my privacy will be taken away, there will be an impact to local wildlife and that the area is not currently able to cope with the water and traffic issues on Gamble Lane (which has already been highlighted to the council). All of the above have to be issues have to be impacted by any change in house number in this area and can only increase risk to the current residents.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Kirsty And Tim Thornton

Representor No: PRS05902

Representation ID: REP06917 Question Ref: H1

We are writing to formally object in the strongest possible terms to the proposals and ongoing consultation on sites 3455A (amber) and 3455B (Green), Gamble Lane Farnley, LS12 5LN

Having recently gone through planning permission to convert Mount Pleasant Barn, considering how stringent the conditions were, we are appalled that the above sites would even be considered for development in the Sire Allocations Plan Volume 2: 11 Outer West, June 2013.

We object also to the core strategy that spreads out development across Leeds, regardless of whether the sites are protected Green belt sites, where other Brown field sites may remain unused (just to satisfy the core strategy!)

We have also objected online.

Our main concerns are :-

- Site 3455B has been close to Landfill and during our building process, we had to provide dangerous gas reports to ensure there were no emissions still from the land. As our build requested a solid concrete sub floor to safeguard from any concerns.

- Preservation of local nature. We conducted a bat survey in line with our planning conditions, and the fields were identified as popular bat flight paths. Exerts from the report include 'There are also many birds (starlings, sparrows and wrens) foxes, countless species of butterflies. During the daytime survey in addition to feral pigeons, small birds including sparrow and wren were observed. By including sparrow terraces this would maintain and enhance biodiversity and meet requirements under section 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 by the opportunity to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments'. The full report is available on request.

- Loss of Farmland. Simon Kellett currently farms on the sites identified, and values site 3455B particularly as good quality farm land. We are aware he has offered an alternative site for consideration. The site is located on Agricultural Lane of grade 3a or above. Such agriculturally rich land should be retained and other lesser sites considered instead.

- The public footpath (number 160) is frequently used with dogs and would be a great loss to the Ramblers Association. Accommodating these ramblers was a condition of our own planning consent.

- Loss of privacy. This site is elevated and any new buildings would directly overlook our property. This would cause a loss of privacy, daylight, sunlight and cause light pollution. As a planning condition for our building we had to be very specific about design, appearance and materials used. Meeting these requirements was a huge financial burden. This proposal is a direct contradiction to all the restrictions imposed on us.

- Increased traffic. As part of our planning conditions, we were instructed to carry out a traffic survey for the additional usage of the existing opening for two more cars (from a building that already existed). The council highways department expressed concern for added traffic flow for one dwelling. The prospect of adding a potential 170 (and therefore a possible 340 cars) in the same area is quite frankly ridiculous. The road network is totally unsuitable and would also be dangerous.

- Loss of protected green belt. This particular green belt saves the local 'countryside' from encroachment, and preserves the setting and characteristics of local area boundaries such as Wortley, Farnley, Pudsey and Bramley, and prevents these neighbouring towns from merging into one another!

Conclusion – We urge the council to consider other sites as the two discussed are entirely unsuitable.

Representation ID: REP06918 Question Ref: H4

No - this site is also a green belt site, with a significant slope, that suffers from poor drainage, and backs onto Post Hill (a very important conservation area and area for locals to exercise their dogs and enjoy an open space so close to the city).

Reasons – all the above reasons from H1 and H2 apply.

Reason – this is a green belt and specialist landscape area and is therefore subject to local and national control. This policy requires a release of land only in exceptional circumstances and subject to a review to ensure other non green belt sites have been considered first. We feel the council has carried out a select review of green belt locations (as we have heard from local farmer[x] in person that some of his land has not been considered as an alternative), which he feels is more suitable. Therefore on what basis has this selected review taken place? Why have the council not carried out a full review of all green belt sites or a growth assessment?

Representation ID: REP06917 Question Ref: H4

H5 – No – 3455A – Gamble Lane, Farnley, LS12 5LN

Reason - The site is located in a rural location with narrow country lanes and with no footways or lighting. The SHLAA assessment references that the site is adjacent to main roads but highlights poor accessibility. Development of the site would lead to increased traffic on totally unsuitable roads to the detriment of highway safety or large amounts of roads improvements to the detriment of the visual appearance of the special landscaped area and green belt.

Sustainability – the site has no public transport or local services within walking distance and would rely on a private car for access. It is therefore not considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF. Other sites should be sought.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Kirsty And Tim Thornton

Representor No: PRS05902

Representation ID: REP06650 Question Ref: H4

We are writing to formally object in the strongest possible terms to the proposals and ongoing consultation on sites 3455A (amber) and 3455B (Green), Gamble Lane Farnley, LS12 5LN

The site is located in a rural location with narrow country lanes and with no footways or lighting. The SHLAA assessment makes reference that the site is adjacent to main roads but also highlights poor accessibility. Development of the site would lead to increased traffic on totally unsuitable roads to the detriment of highway safety or large amounts of road improvements to the detriment of the visual appearance of the special landscaped area and green belt.

Sustainability – the site has no public transport or local services within walking distance and would rely on a private car for access. It is therefore not considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF. Other sites should be sought.

This is a green belt and specialist landscape area and is therefore subject to local and national control. This policy requires a release of land only in exceptional circumstances and subject to a review to ensure other non green belt sites have been considered first. We feel the council has carried out a select review of green belt locations (as we have heard from local farmer Simon Kellet in person that some of his land has not been considered as an alternative), which he feels is more suitable. Therefore on what basis has this selected review taken place? Why have the council not carried out a full review of all green belt sites or a growth assessment?

This site is also a green belt site, with a significant slope, that suffers from poor drainage, and backs onto Post Hill (a very important conservation area and area for locals to exercise their dogs and enjoy an open space so close to the city).

Having recently gone through planning permission to convert Mount Pleasant Barn, considering how stringent the conditions were, we are appalled that the above sites would even be considered for development.

We object also to the core strategy that spreads out development across Leeds, regardless of whether the sites are protected Green belt sites, where other Brown field sites may remain unused (just to satisfy the core strategy!)

Our main concerns are :-

- Site 3455B has been close to Landfill and during our building process, we had to provide dangerous gas reports to ensure there were no emissions still from the land. As our build requested a solid concrete sub floor to safeguard from any concerns.
- Preservation of local nature. We conducted a bat survey in line with our planning conditions, and the fields were identified as popular bat flight paths. Exerts from the report include 'There are also many birds (starlings, sparrows and wrens) foxes, countless species of butterflies. During the daytime survey in addition to feral pigeons, small birds including sparrow and wren were observed. By including sparrow terraces this would maintain and enhance biodiversity and meet requirements under section 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 by the opportunity to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments'. The full report is available on request.
- Loss of Farmland. Simon Kellett currently farms on the sites identified, and values site 3455B particularly as good quality farm land. We are aware he has offered an alternative site for consideration. The site is located on Agricultural Lane of grade 3a or above. Such agriculturally rich land should be retained and other lesser sites considered instead.
- The public footpath (number 160) is frequently used with dogs and would be a great loss to the Ramblers Association. Accommodating these ramblers was a condition of our own planning consent.
- Loss of privacy. This site is elevated and any new buildings would directly overlook our property. This would cause a loss of privacy, daylight, sunlight and cause light pollution. As a planning condition for our building we had to be very specific about design, appearance and materials used. Meeting these requirements was a huge financial burden. This proposal is a direct contradiction to all the restrictions imposed on us.
- Increased traffic. As part of our planning conditions, we were instructed to carry out a traffic survey for the additional usage of the existing opening for two more cars (from a building that already existed). The council highways department expressed concern for added traffic flow for one dwelling. The prospect of adding a potential 170 (and therefore a possible 340 cars) in the same area is quite frankly ridiculous. The road network is totally unsuitable and would also be dangerous.
- Loss of protected green belt. This particular green belt saves the local 'countryside' from encroachment, and preserves the setting and characteristics of local area boundaries such as Wortley, Farnley, Pudsey and Bramley, and prevents these neighbouring towns from merging into one another!

Conclusion – We urge the council to consider other sites as the two discussed are entirely unsuitable.

Representation ID: REP06918 Question Ref: H5

No – 3455A – Gamble Lane, Farnley, LS12 5LN

Reason - The site is located in a rural location with narrow country lanes and with no footways or lighting. The SHLAA assessment references that the site is adjacent to main roads but highlights poor accessibility. Development of the site would lead to increased traffic on totally unsuitable roads to the detriment of highway safety or large amounts of road improvements to the detriment of the visual appearance of the special landscaped area and green belt.

Sustainability – the site has no public transport or local services within walking distance and would rely on a private car for access. It is therefore not considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF. Other sites should be sought.

Additional reasons for the objections are also outlined above

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Kirsty And Tim Thornton

Representor No: PRS05902

Representation ID: REP06650 Question Ref: H5

No – 3455A – Gamble Lane, Farnley, LS12 5LN

Reason - The site is located in a rural location with narrow country lanes and with no footways or lighting. The SHLAA assessment references that the site is adjacent to main roads but highlights poor accessibility. Development of the site would lead to increased traffic on totally unsuitable roads to the detriment of highway safety or large amounts of roads improvements to the detriment of the visual appearance of the special landscaped area and green belt.

Sustainability – the site has no public transport or local services within walking distance and would rely on a private car for access. It is therefore not considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF. Other sites should be sought.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Tim Madden

Representor No: PRS06038

Representation ID: REP06870 Question Ref: H4

I write in response to your consultation on the allocation of housing in the Leeds District. I accept the need for adequate supplies of new housing in the district in order to provide suitable and affordable housing for Leeds residents, to support the growth and economic vitality of the city. Any new housing site however has to be in line with national, regional and local planning policy, be sustainable and not put undue pressure on the existing infrastructure.

I refer to your current consultation exercise and would like to comment on two specific sites in the Farnley and Wortley Area.

Site 3455A - Gamble Lane Farnley

This site is coloured pink on the plan.

Policy – The site is located in Green Belt and Special Landscape Area subject to national and local control. This policy requires the release of land only in exceptional circumstance and subject to a review to ensure that other none green belt sites have been considered first.

I note the Council has carried out a selective review of Green Belt locations. On what basis has this selective review of sites taken place? Why have the council not carried out a full review of all Green Belt sites or a Growth Assessment.

Access – The site is located in a rural location with narrow country lanes and with no footways or lighting. Development of the site would lead to increased traffic on unsuitable roads to the detriment of highway safety or large amounts of road improvements to the detriment of the visual appearance of the Special Landscape Area and Green Belt.

Green Belt - The site currently assists in preventing the merging of settlements and checking unrestricted sprawl of the built up area. It therefore conforms to the national policy for Green Belt and its development for housing would be contrary to the NPPF and seriously detrimental to the Green Belt in this location

Farmland – The site is located on Agricultural Lane of Grade 3a or above. Such viable and agriculturally rich land should be retained and other lesser site considered in advance of it.

Sustainability – The site has no public transport or local services within walking distance and would rely on the private car for access. It is therefore not considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF other sites should be sought.

Conclusion - Site 3455A – Gamble Lane is not suitable for housing development due to its poor access, location in the Green Belt and Special Landscape Area, high Grade agricultural land and unsustainable position. Other more suitable sites should be considered ahead of it and it should be removed from the list of sites at this stage.

Site 3455B – Gamble Lane, Farnley

The site is coloured green on the plan

Policy – The site is located in Green Belt and Special Landscape Area subject to

national and local control. This policy requires the release of land only in exceptional circumstance and subject to a review to ensure that other none green belt sites have been considered first.

I note the Council has carried out a selective review of Green Belt locations. On what basis has this selective review of sites taken place? Why have the council not carried out a full review of all Green Belt sites or a Growth Assessment.

Access – The site is located in a rural location with narrow country lanes and with no footways or lighting. The SHLAA Assessment notes that the site is adjacent to main roads but notes poor accessibility. Development of the site would lead to increased traffic on unsuitable roads to the detriment of highway safety or large amounts of road improvements to the detriment of the visual appearance of the Special Landscape Area and Green Belt.

Green Belt - The site currently assists in preventing the merging of settlements and checking unrestricted sprawl of the built up area. It therefore conforms to the national policy for Green Belt and its development for housing would be contrary to the NPPF and seriously detrimental to the Green Belt in this location

Farmland – The site is located on Agricultural Lane of Grade 3a or above. Such viable and agriculturally rich land should be retained and other lesser site considered in advance of it. The site contains farm buildings which continue to be in agricultural use and development would lead to the loss of a viable farm unit.

Sustainability – The site has no public transport or local services within walking distance and would rely on the private car for access. It is therefore not considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF other sites should be sought.

Conclusion - Site 3455B – Gamble Lane is not suitable for housing development due to its poor access, location in the Green Belt and Special Landscape Area, high Grade agricultural land, viable farm unit and unsustainable position. Other more suitable sites should be considered ahead of it and it should be removed

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455A

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Tim Madden

Representor No: PRS06038

from the list of sites at this stage.

Name: Josie Madden

Representor No: PRS06051

Representation ID: REP06895 Question Ref: H4

Sites 3455A

Site 3455A - Gamble Lane Farnley

This site is coloured pink on the plan.

Policy – The site is located in Green Belt and Special Landscape Area subject to national and local control. This policy requires the release of land only in exceptional circumstance and subject to a review to ensure that other none green belt sites have been considered first.

I note the Council has carried out a selective review of Green Belt locations . On what basis has this selective review of sites taken place? Why have the council not carried out a full review of all Green Belt sites or a Growth Assessment.

Access – The site is located in a rural location with narrow country lanes and with no footways or lighting. Development of the site would lead to increased traffic on unsuitable roads to the detriment of highway safety or large amounts of road improvements to the detriment of the visual appearance of the Special Landscape Area and Green Belt.

Green Belt - The site currently assists in preventing the merging of settlements and checking unrestricted sprawl of the built up area. It therefore conforms to the national policy for Green Belt and its development for housing would be contrary to the NPPF and seriously detrimental to the Green Belt in this location

Farmland – The site is located on Agricultural Lane of Grade 3a or above. Such viable and agriculturally rich land should be retained and other lesser site considered in advance of it.

Sustainability – The site has no public transport or local services within walking distance and would rely on the private car for access. It is therefore not considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF other sites should be sought.

Conclusion - Site 3455A – Gamble Lane is not suitable for housing development due to its poor access, location in the Green Belt and Special Landscape Area, high Grade agricultural land and unsustainable position. Other more suitable sites should be considered ahead of it and it should be removed from the list of sites at this stage.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Susan Sanders

Representor No: PRS00024

Representation ID: REP00430 Question Ref: H1

There are a number of housing plots in local areas where building demolished, Beeston, Wortley High School, Oldfield Lane to name a few where new housing would increase property value to existing residents as eye sores would be replaced.

Representation ID: REP00430 Question Ref: H2

This is backing on to green belt land i.e. Post Hill - where wildlife and nature is well respected & appreciated. On Hare Farm Mount only reason as a resident I live there. 'To live near the countryside' - taking this away would further reduce this in Leeds.

Name: Brian Patterson

Representor No: PRS00083

Representation ID: REP00489 Question Ref: H1

Poor access to both sites. No local amenities to speak of. Gamble Lane can't cope with all the extra traffic this will create. Bad access off Tong Road.

Name: Lynne Patterson

Representor No: PRS00084

Representation ID: REP00490 Question Ref: H1

With poor access on to Tong Road and more traffic on to Gamble Lane, where would all the extra residents enter these sites? Congestion is an issue on the Ring Road before all this extra traffic would be created. Also it would add more pollution. There are two really bad bends on Tong Road which would interfere with entrances and exits on the two sites. Where would the alternative access be? With upwards of 700 people to be living on these sites (potentially) where are the GPs surgeries, schools and supermarkets in this area to sustain them. Where are the public transport links, there are no buses or trains around these sites, adding to the already busy roads. Gamble Lane is not made for the amount of traffic using it now without more being forced on to it because of lack of services. Where would all the extra vehicles go?

Representation ID: REP06045 Question Ref: H1

I would like to put forward my objections to you allocating this land for housing.

Firstly, this is greenbelt land, as you know, which is getting less and less. Also, site 3455B is a valuable wildlife habitat at the bottom behind the houses in Gamble Lane because of all the trees where, also, it tends to flood during the winter due to the natural springs and the steeply sloping site.

Both sites have poor access and, I feel, would force more traffic on to Gamble Lane if the houses were built. The proposed access on to Tong Road has its own problems, it is a very busy and fast road with a blind bend towards the Beulah Public house and and the access into Gamble Lane which is not visible until you are nearly on top of it, this has the potential to force more traffic down Gambl Lane.

If these two sites were to be joined, access would have to be across Gamble Lane, therefore, also creating more traffic. Also, there are no footpaths or street lighting on that part of the Lane making it more dangerous. If these developments were to go ahead, I assume that they would be family houses and, mainly, families have two cars, ergo, even more vehicles on the already too busy Gamble Lane.

There are no public transport links local to these sites or any public ammenities. eg GP's surgeries, supermarkets, etc.

All in all, I do believe that it would not be a good idea for this site to be allocated for housing.

Name: Paul Smith

Representor No: PRS00129

Representation ID: REP00901 Question Ref: H1

3455B - Building on this land will not only spoil the green site but disturb wildlife, and cause extra un-needed traffic on Gamble Lane.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: John Hardy

Representor No: PRS00192

Representation ID: REP02122 Question Ref: H1

3455B - Strongly against site for planning and sustainability reasons:- no schools- no public transport- no shopsThe number of homes proposed won't give enough contributions to pay for all these things.

Representation ID: REP00248 Question Ref: H1

3455B is not sustainable in planning terms

Representation ID: REP00248 Question Ref: H7

not sustainable in planning terms

Representation ID: REP00248 Question Ref: H2

3455B is not sustainable in planning terms

Name: Lauren Kearney

Representor No: PRS00194

Representation ID: REP02124 Question Ref: H1

3455B - 1 House would overlook my property

2 Landfill site is below field

3 Buildings would spoil beauty of countryside

4 Wildlife would be affected

5 Increased traffic causing more risk of accidents

6 Increased icy road conditions from land development

Name: Andrea Holden

Representor No: PRS00206

Representation ID: REP02138 Question Ref: H1

3455B - Houses would overlook my property

Landfill site was below the field

Buildings would spoil beauty and countryside

Wildlife would be affected

Increased traffic causing more risk of accidents

Increased icy road conditions from land in winter.

Name: Jean Mackintosh

Representor No: PRS00306

Representation ID: REP02248 Question Ref: H1

3455B -

To whom it may concern

I am writing to submit my opposition to the site allocation plans for sites 3455a and 3455b which are currently open for consultation

This site is not suitable for development for several reasons

Water is a big big issue

There are several underground streams coming from various sources

Mainly from the fields where the proposed houses will be built

The main road Gamble Lane/ and Water Lane flood when water drains down

In the winter these roads when wet become death traps with ice

Also speeding is an issue now so extra traffic will only increase danger

Even though there are signs in place now

Also there is wild life in the area

Bats/foxes/deer which enhance the natural area of green fields

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: G Mackintosh

Representor No: PRS00307

Representation ID: REP02249 Question Ref: H1

3455B -

To whom it may concern

I am writing to submit my opposition to the site allocation plans for sites 3455a and 3455b which are currently open for consultation

This site is not suitable for development for several reasons

Water is a big big issue

There are several underground streams coming from various sources

Mainly from the fields where the proposed houses will be built

The main road Gamble Lane/ and Water Lane flood when water drains down

In the winter these roads when wet become death traps with ice

Also speeding is an issue now so extra traffic will only increase danger

Even though there are signs in place now

Also there is wild life in the area

Bats/foxes/deer which enhance the natural area of green fields

Name: P Woodhead

Representor No: PRS00528

Representation ID: REP02477 Question Ref: H1

We are writing to object to the proposed building on green belt land. It would put extra traffic on the already busy Gamble Lane and Tong Road. Tong Road is a very fast road with speeding drivers who take little notice of the 50 speed limit sign. There have been numerous accidents on this road especially at the junction where we live. More traffic would increase this risk. Also it would spoil the landscape of this rural area, we don't want to see housing built on it. We are on the Leeds/Bradford boundary and don't want any more land eaten up by building.

Name: Pamela Rogers

Representor No: PRS00548

Representation ID: REP02499 Question Ref: H1

3455B – Against.

1.Traffic

2.Noise

3.Light to house

4.Habitat in field

5.Privacy

6.Green belt land

7.Disruption of footpath

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Jonathan Newbould

Representor No: PRS00856

Representation ID: REP07392 Question Ref: H1

Concerning site allocation plans 3455A and 3455 B, I have sent two letters during the consultation period, one last week and one two weeks ago and I am yet to receive a reply.

We, as the people that you represent, have a right to share our vies about these ridiculous plans, if you even are a democracy - and we expect replies to our letters of complaint.

I have raised a number of issues to why these sites are unsuitable, and thus I expect a reply to my letters immediately, explaining if my points have changed the plans for the sites (they should, or rather, they WILL).

I expect a reply immediately to this email, and to receive a formal letter by Friday 2nd.

PS- More evidence has come to light as to why the sites are unsuitable - in previous years the site was used temporarily to dump asbestos. It is still there, buried.

Representation ID: REP02874 Question Ref: H1

3455B - I am writing in regard to the proposed plans of development of sites at the top of Gamble Lane, Farnley. These sites (3455A and 3455B) are NOT suitable for development, as I have explained in a previous letter, and this one — as new information has come to light.

Firstly, there are a number of natural springs underneath Gamble Lane and Water Lane, for the whole length of the street (Tong Road to Butt Lane). The amount of traffic on the street has caused cracks to emerge from the constant weight of these cars. The new housing development of 350 houses would bring a further 700 cars to the street, and this would cause irreversible damage to the road. The weight may cause the earth above the springs to collapse — causing the council to repair the road and reinforce the support of the road from more cracks that may emerge. The road cannot deal with the weight of these cars, and thus more houses on this street are implausible. The springs are making the road weak at the moment, without an extra 700 cars.

Furthermore, the top of Gamble Lane, where there are no paths was not constructed as a public road. This section of road was a dirt track, created during the Second World War for Military access only to the Post Hill Prisoner of War Camp for Italian POWs, and the Military shooting range. Thus the road is very unsuitable for housing development, as it is dangerous to pedestrians, and would only add more pressure onto your budget.

Detroit went bankrupt only recently, and they are developing old, abandoned Brownfield sites and increasing the amount of agricultural and woodland to increase the population. Leeds City Council should be doing this. Develop houses on the sites closer the city centre, which look horribly decrepit, and leave the Greenfield sites (3455a and b) alone to increase the population and economy of Leeds. The land under proposed development is the factor which sells homes, and without that, there would not be a draw to this area, causing houses to linger on the market for over a year and not sell.

PICTURE ABOVE:[Scanned]

Cracks run all the way down the street and spurt of regularly to either side of the street. These cracks are in abundance, and in places, are rather deep.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Jonathan Newbould

Representor No: PRS00856

Representation ID: REP04084 Question Ref: H4

3455B -

I am writing in regard to the proposed plans of development of sites at the top of Gamble Lane, Farnley. These sites (3455A and 3455B) are NOT suitable for development for a number of reasons, which will be explained in this letter.

Indeed, there is a need for new houses as population increases, however these sites are GREEN FILED sites, and the council should look towards BROWN FIELD sites for redevelopment. These sites are completely unsuitable for residential development, and I can assure that Councillor John Hardy and the residents of Gable Lane, Water Lane, Wood Lane and the surrounding area will put up an astounding fight to stop the plan of greedy Councillors to place 350 houses on precious and loved agricultural land.

Reasons as to why the site is completely unsuitable for development are as follows:

I. DESTRUCTION OF GREEN FIELD SITES

The sites proposed for developments (3455A and 3455B) are part of the GREEN BELT and are GREEN FIELD SITES. Rather than the Council developing Green Field Sites, they should develop Brown field sites that have fallen into disrepair. A number of Brown field sites can be found closer to the city centre, and provide an abundance of land for more houses than the proposed 350 on this Green field site. Brown fields need redevelopment more desperately, than development for monetary gain to destroy agricultural and wood land.

II. WILDLIFE DISRUPTION

The development would destroy agricultural land that is rich with wildlife. In the proposed area, there are grasshoppers, crickets, foxes, frogs, dragonflies, butterflies, rabbits, hedgehogs, squirrels, as well as a multitude of birds including the REDKITE (which is a species only recently introduced back into the country, and need to be peacefully left to breed and repopulate). Furthermore, the area is a hotspot for bats, and the trees and outbuildings in sites 3455A and 3455B are home to bats. NOBODY CAN DISTURB BATS, BY LAW.

III. SWAGE SYSTEMS

When development occurs, the new drainage system is attached onto the existing drainage system of said street. The sewage system of Gamble Lane is archaic. To my, and several other individuals' understanding, Gamble Lane's Victorian sewage system has already been added onto in the 1920s, 1930s, 1970s and 1980s. 300+ new houses would suffocate, and damage the sewage/drainage system, causing lagging and overflow. Gamble Lane's sewage system was not designed for such an intake of water and human waste. Adding onto the system, as you most certainly would do, would ruin it.

You are fools if you build 350 new houses on top of a Georgian/Victorian sewage system.

IV. TRAFFIC

Gamble Lane is a small road. It is a road that is designed only to take the traffic of the residents' cars. The road has natural springs running underneath it for the whole length, and due to the traffic existing on the road already, a large crack has formed in the middle of the road. 350 new houses means probably 700 new cars.

Gamble Lane is too small for this traffic, and so is Wood Lane, and so is Tong Road.

Not only would this traffic cause damage to the actual road, but it would cause a threat to the residents of the street. These new cars would race down, causing a threat to the lives of the children playing on the street, or elderly homeowners strolling across to their neighbours homes. It is a relaxed lane, and more traffic would cost lives by people being run down by cars.

You are supposed to represent us, however letting these housing plans go ahead shows that you do not care about the people of this city, and you are in the wrong job as all you care about is money. PROVE that YOU are in the right job, and you are GOOD AT IT! Or do you not care about car crashes and child mortality rates? If you have a child or elderly parent of your own, you would not want their quiet home to be disturbed by loud traffic that may threaten their safety at home! Do something to help your people, it is your job. Otherwise, vive la revolution.

V. SCHOOL PLACES/LOCAL AMMENATIES/DOCTORS

In the area surrounding Gamble Lane, there are no local amenities. The local schools are 1.5 miles away, however the doctors are much more further away in Wortley and Pudsey. There are no shops. The sites are miles away from anywhere. Houses around this area take forever to sell, sometimes sitting on the market for even a year, unsold. These new homes will not sell, so do NOT ruin Green belt land on a whim!

VI. PUBLIC FOOTPATHS

The two sites, 3455a and 3455b encompass Public Footpaths. The National Trust suggest that paths found on maps (these are) have public right of way. One of the paths, in 3455A serves as an entrance to Post Hill Woods. You cannot destroy this pathway, as the public have a right to walk through this field. And so they shall.

Thank you for reading my letter of complaint. I hope that my views will serve helpful in this period of consultation and that they prove to sway the argument helped by the other complaints from private residents. I hope to hear from you soon.

This letter, and others sent to protest against these plans should make a huge difference to stop these plans as we live in a democracy. Leeds City Council should be a democracy, and if the views of residents are disregarded, is Leeds City Council not just a hypocritical, backwards, and corrupt Stalinist hierarchy. The Council should listen to our plea, and if they do not, they are only money grabbing bastards who are in the wrong profession as they do not care about the people they

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Jonathan Newbould

Representor No: PRS00856

are supposed to represent.

Name: Firth

Representor No: PRS00962

Representation ID: REP03003 Question Ref: H1

As a local residents, we are writing to object to the proposed development of sites 3455A Amber and 3455B Green for housing.

These are our objections:

1 Both sites are part of the Green Belt and have been farmed for generations.

2 Wildlife on both sites will be destroyed and the footpaths would be disrupted. The footpath across site 3455A is used daily by walkers to access Post Hill.

3 Both sites are elevated and new development would cause loss of privacy and loss of light.

4 Gamble Lane and Tong Road already carry heavy traffic and are not suitable for the larger amount of traffic which would be created by the proposed housing.

5 Gamble Lane is badly affected by water running off site 3455A. In winter the lane ices up and becomes treacherous.

Name: Boland

Representor No: PRS01626

Representation ID: REP03778 Question Ref: H1

3455B -

As residents of Hare park mount we feel we must stongly object to the proposed sites

3455A and 3455B being use for building development.

OUR OBJECTIONS BEING,

1, Both sites are classed as green belt sites that are suppose to stop the spread of urban areas, and are at present still used for farming.

2, Both sites also attacked a variety of wildlife and are used as wildlife corridors, my husband has recorded around sixty different species of birds whilst we have lived here.

his will certainly decline if work goes ahead.

3, The sites are also enjoyed by walkers of all ages, and a path along site 3455A gives dirrect access to post hill an area that is classed as a Leeds nature area, and would be susceptible to the light pollution, noise, litter ect.

4, With site 3455A being on a elivated position to Hare park mount, building work would mean a lack of privacy to these house plus cause a lack of natural light.

5, Gamble lane is unsuitable for heavy traffic and more houses means more vehicles in the area.

it is also used as a rat run to get to the ring road, with most drivers doing above the speed limit.

It has also been considered to hazardous to be used by public transport companies

7 resulting in none doing so.

6, Gamble lane also floods when it rain, the water running off the site 3455A which also contains natural springs, this freezes when the weather turns cold making the road hazardous

to all, and more concrete and tarmac ect is going to make the situation worse.

plus when its snows Gamble lane and Tong road can both become unpassable.

7, AND MOST IMPORTANT ONCE DESTROYED LEEDS WILL NEVER GET

ITS GREEN SPACES BACK.

Therefor we urge you to consider leaving the proposed sites as green belt and farmland.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: B Waud

Representor No: PRS01744

Representation ID: REP03907 Question Ref: H1

3455B -

I am writing to submit my opposition to the site allocation plans for sites 3455A & 3455B, which are currently open for consultation.

GREEN SITE

Question H1 - 3455B

Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as "green" represent the most suitable sites to consider allocating for future housing developments?

I do not believe that this site is suitable for the following reasons:-

- There is an underground streams running from various sources on Gamble Lane. If the trees/green belt land is taken away, the water from the fields will increase and effect local residents by way further water into properties.
- Increased water in the local drainage system, which is already problematic and feeds into the reservoir and local water systems.
- Impact on local schools and service will be impacted, increased properties means new surgeries/school — do we have space for them in the area?
- Risk of further sprawl to adjoining green belt fields
- Currently the area is very quiet and private — 170 houses on this field will increase the noise pollution and will result in damage to the local wildlife. It will also increase traffic to already busy roads, such as Tong Road and Gamble Lane — which already have speeding issues.

Representation ID: REP03907 Question Ref: H2

Question H2 - 3455B

Which Sites do you disagree with and why?

I disagree for following reasons:-

- Reduction in privacy to local residents — who purchased properties knowing the only intrusion, would be tractors and farm vehicles.
- Traffic levels on both Gamble Lane and Tong Road are already high and speed is particularly and issue coming out onto Gamble Lane from Hare Park Mount — due to speed of traffic, icy roads (due to over surface water) which will only get worse if plans of 170/340 extra houses go ahead.
- Green belt land - with the nature and feel of countryside - the new properties will change the look and feel of the area and impact on nature and usage. i.e Deer/Foxes/Public footpaths /Equestrian rights of way. There is a lot of equestrian usage in this area and the changes would result in this dropping due to again the road safely and lack of countryside.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: C Cross

Representor No: PRS01747

Representation ID: REP03909 Question Ref: H1

3455B -

I am writing to submit my opposition to the site allocation plans for sites 3455A & 3455B, which are currently open for consultation.

GREEN SITE

Question H1 - 3455B

Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as "green" represent the most suitable sites to consider allocating for future housing developments?

I do not believe that this site is suitable for the following reasons:-

- There is an underground streams running from various sources on Gamble Lane. If the trees/green belt land is taken away, the water from the fields will increase and effect local residents by way further water into properties.
- Increased water in the local drainage system, which is already problematic and feeds into the reservoir and local water systems.
- Impact on local schools and service will be impacted, increased properties means new surgeries/school — do we have space for them in the area?
- Risk of further sprawl to adjoining green belt fields
- Currently the area is very quiet and private — 170 houses on this field will increase the noise pollution and will result in damage to the local wildlife. It will also increase traffic to already busy roads, such as Tong Road and Gamble Lane — which already have speeding issues.

Representation ID: REP03909 Question Ref: H2

Question H2 - 3455B

Which Sites do you disagree with and why?

I disagree for following reasons:-

- Reduction in privacy to local residents — who purchased properties knowing the only intrusion, would be tractors and farm vehicles.
- Traffic levels on both Gamble Lane and Tong Road are already high and speed is particularly and issue coming out onto Gamble Lane from Hare Park Mount — due to speed of traffic, icy roads (due to over surface water) which will only get worse if plans of 170/340 extra houses go ahead.
- Green belt land - with the nature and feel of countryside - the new properties will change the look and feel of the area and impact on nature and usage. i.e Deer/Foxes/Public footpaths /Equestrian rights of way. There is a lot of equestrian usage in this area and the changes would result in this dropping due to again the road safely and lack of countryside.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: D Sloane

Representor No: PRS01757

Representation ID: REP03921 Question Ref: H1

3455B -

I am writing to submit my opposition to the site allocation plans for sites 3455A & 3455B, which are currently open for consultation.

GREEN SITE

Question H1 - 3455B

Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as "green" represent the most suitable sites to consider allocating for future housing developments?

I do not believe that this site is suitable for the following reasons:-

- There is an underground streams running from various sources on Gamble Lane. If the trees/green belt land is taken away, the water from the fields will increase and effect local residents by way further water into properties.
- Increased water in the local drainage system, which is already problematic and feeds into the reservoir and local water systems.
- Impact on local schools and service will be impacted, increased properties means new surgeries/school — do we have space for them in the area?
- Risk of further sprawl to adjoining green belt fields
- Currently the area is very quiet and private — 170 houses on this field will increase the noise pollution and will result in damage to the local wildlife. It will also increase traffic to already busy roads, such as Tong Road and Gamble Lane — which already have speeding issues.

Representation ID: REP03921 Question Ref: H2

Question H2 - 3455B

Which Sites do you disagree with and why?

I disagree for following reasons:-

- Reduction in privacy to local residents — who purchased properties knowing the only intrusion, would be tractors and farm vehicles.
- Traffic levels on both Gamble Lane and Tong Road are already high and speed is particularly and issue coming out onto Gamble Lane from Hare Park Mount — due to speed of traffic, icy roads (due to over surface water) which will only get worse if plans of 170/340 extra houses go ahead.
- Green belt land - with the nature and feel of countryside - the new properties will change the look and feel of the area and impact on nature and usage. i.e Deer/Foxes/Public footpaths /Equestrian rights of way. There is a lot of equestrian usage in this area and the changes would result in this dropping due to again the road safely and lack of countryside.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: G Sloane

Representor No: PRS01789

Representation ID: REP03958 Question Ref: H1

3455B -

I am writing to submit my opposition to the site allocation plans for sites 3455A & 3455B, which are currently open for consultation.

GREEN SITE

Question H1 - 3455B

Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as "green" represent the most suitable sites to consider allocating for future housing developments?

I do not believe that this site is suitable for the following reasons:-

- There is an underground streams running from various sources on Gamble Lane. If the trees/green belt land is taken away, the water from the fields will increase and effect local residents by way further water into properties.
- Increased water in the local drainage system, which is already problematic and feeds into the reservoir and local water systems.
- Impact on local schools and service will be impacted, increased properties means new surgeries/school — do we have space for them in the area?
- Risk of further sprawl to adjoining green belt fields
- Currently the area is very quiet and private — 170 houses on this field will increase the noise pollution and will result in damage to the local wildlife. It will also increase traffic to already busy roads, such as Tong Road and Gamble Lane — which already have speeding issues.

Representation ID: REP03958 Question Ref: H2

Question H2 - 3455B

Which Sites do you disagree with and why?

I disagree for following reasons:-

- Reduction in privacy to local residents — who purchased properties knowing the only intrusion, would be tractors and farm vehicles.
- Traffic levels on both Gamble Lane and Tong Road are already high and speed is particularly and issue coming out onto Gamble Lane from Hare Park Mount — due to speed of traffic, icy roads (due to over surface water) which will only get worse if plans of 170/340 extra houses go ahead.
- Green belt land - with the nature and feel of countryside - the new properties will change the look and feel of the area and impact on nature and usage. i.e Deer/Foxes/Public footpaths /Equestrian rights of way. There is a lot of equestrian usage in this area and the changes would result in this dropping due to again the road safely and lack of countryside.

Name: Shelia Pearson

Representor No: PRS01847

Representation ID: REP05326 Question Ref: H1

I object to this for two reasons

1. Loss of green belt/farming land
2. Increased level of traffic. Gamble Lane particularly is already a nightmare with the volume of traffic for such a narrow winding lane

Name: Graham Dodds

Representor No: PRS02654

Representation ID: REP00379 Question Ref: G1

I very much have objection to any of the plans to delete or alter boundaries or greenspace in this area. the areas of greenbelt you are proposing to delete for housing are home to wildlife bats birds foxes and is small part of farmlay that remains unspoilt, and allows us a little bit of countryside which I and all our neighbours truly value and appreciate as we live on the border of your plan sites 34455a and 3455b.i also would like to point out that I have lived in hare park munt 27yrs.i was refused planning permission twice if you check .I still have the documents.you refused planning saying thst my plans for loft conversion would result in an alien and incongruous feature however it wouldn't have been seen by anyone as was farmland and not overlooked by anyone. I believe your new plans for this greenbelt land to be visually intrusive to me and my family and also all residents who are campaigning to keep this land as it is.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Priestley

Representor No: PRS02983

Representation ID: REP05552 Question Ref: H1

[x]

Sent: 24 July 2013 10:46

To: Department of Planning

[x]

Dear Sir or Madam,

We have been contacted by [x] concerning site allocations 3455a and 3455b which propose the building of 170 new houses on either side of Gamble Lane. [x] is vehemently against these proposals and I would be grateful if you could provide me with an update regarding the applications current status.

Thank you for your help.

Kind regards,

[x]

Name: Mrs Mcgough

Representor No: PRS02988

Representation ID: REP05556 Question Ref: H1

I write in connection with the ongoing consultation about land on two sides off Gamble Lane 3455A Amber and 3455B Green.

I have examined the plans and I know the sites well and wish to object strongly to any proposed housing development on these green belt sites.

To your questions H1 NO

H2 NO 3455B

H4 NO

H5 NO 3455A

The following points are my objections for the proposed development of both sites:

- The loss of a great tract of green belt and farmland.
- The impact on wild life in the fields, hedges and on nearby Post Hill.
- The disruption of local footpaths. The footpath across 3455A is used daily by many dog walkers to reach Post Hill.
- The loss of a natural break between nearby communities, creating an ugly urbansprawl.
- Site 3455A is elevated and housing would overlook existing properties, causing loss of privacy, daylight, sunlight and cause light pollution.
- Site 3455A is called Spring Park. It produces great amounts of water running down Gamble Lane, specially after wet weather. In winter it freezes, to cause dangerous road conditions.

Traffic is already heavy on Tong Road and particularly down Gamble Lane. These roads would come under further pressure from traffic the proposed development for 340 houses would create.

Both sites maybe unstable to build on due to historic mine workings.

In conclusion, I would like to urge the Council to utilise existing brown field sites first, before taking another slice of irreplaceable green belt land!

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Dorothy Ward

Representor No: PRS02989

Representation ID: REP05558 Question Ref: H1

[x]

Sent: 09 July 2013 16:25

To: LDF Leeds

Subject: site allocations 3455a/3455B

[x]

Dear Sirs

I would like to object to the above sites to be used for housing.

Where these are located is a small, rural site at the top of a narrow country lane with no footpaths or lighting and a bad blind bend near the site 3455a.

Access to these sites would be on to Tong Road which would be dangerous as the traffic travels fast down there and I believe that it would force them to use Gamble Lane instead, which is already a rat run and was not built for the amount vehicles that use it now. Gamble lane has a national speed limit on it which the motorists ignore so more traffic would be a nightmare for us residents who already have to run the gambit of these drivers.

Where are all the schools for the extra children to go to? There are no doctors or dentists in the area, no supermarkets and no public transport services. There are no amenities whatsoever.

Site 3455B has a very steep slope which has a tendency to flood at the bottom, it also is a good wildlife habitat. Where are they to go if these houses were built?

There have been houses for sale in this area which have been taken off the market because they have not sold so why do we need more

houses here? There are areas of Leeds with houses that have been boarded up, why can't these be used. I think that money spent on these would be a good investment instead of buiding new houses on greenbelt/greenfield land. Why not use brownfield sites instead?

Yours faithfully

[x]

Name: David Pearson

Representor No: PRS03242

Representation ID: REP00966 Question Ref: H2

The site at the top of Gamble Lane (Leeds 12).The traffic in this area is already a cause for concern and further development in this area would only exacerbate the situation

Name: Ruth Robson

Representor No: PRS03389

Representation ID: REP00024 Question Ref: H1

*The sites are open green spaces & agricultural land and are considered most suitable because infrastructure costs and road access costs will be lower than on local sites considered suitable but with issues, i.e., higher development costs.

Representation ID: REP00024 Question Ref: H5

Sites 3455B and 1171B as noted previously above

Representation ID: REP00024 Question Ref: H2

Sites 3455B and 1171B*They are open greenfield sites visually prominent as one leaves the built up areas on the eastern side of the Ring Rd. They are useful agricultural land and such land will be more valuable as a food source in the future.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Denise Campbell

Representor No: PRS03643

Representation ID: REP01017 Question Ref: H2

H2 – Site 3455B Reason i) SW aspect of site in Coal Referral Area. - Ref. SHLAA Update 2012 Full Report Part 2ii) Site identified as having significant risk of contamination. – Ref. Groundsure Report dated 20/08/2013 (see attached document) iii) Natural watercourse on the steeply sloping NW boundary of the site where abutting the rear gardens of Gamble Lane. This causes the rear garden of 63 Gamble Lane (and possibly others) to waterlog during periods of heavy and/or prolonged rain. This watercourse is culverted via the main drain in Water Lane to the Farnley Valley Balancing Reservoir. This reservoir was built to prevent the beck flooding in Wortley. Development of this site and the associated hard landscaping will only increase surface water run off to this watercourse. iv) Development of this site would create a new vehicular corridor from Tong Road to Gamble Lane and would also provide access to Site 3455A (Amber). Gamble Lane is already used as a shortcut from Tong Road. If one (170 housing units) or both (340 housing units) sites were developed the associated increase in traffic would create a significant risk of noise pollution to the residents of Gamble Lane/Wood Lane/Water Lane and make Gamble Lane/Wood Lane/Water Lane an unsafe environment. v) The site is approximately 15m above the rear of the properties on Gamble Lane and development could raise a number of issues including Overlooking Loss of daylight/sunlight/moonlight Light pollution

Name: Joanne Mitchell

Representor No: PRS03683

Representation ID: REP01597 Question Ref: H2

Site reference 3455B does not constitute sustainable planning as it does not ensure vitality of the city centre, nor protect the green belt land as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework. Residential development on this site would not provide residents accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being as the local schools are already full and there is a lack of public transport or community amenities on the upper part of Tong Road. Development of this site will not make it easier to create jobs in the city or replace poor design with better design, and would contravene all five principles of green belt protection: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Name: Rebecca Cumberworth

Representor No: PRS04070

Representation ID: REP00780 Question Ref: H1

Many of the 'green' sites are green belt. I strongly disagree with the development of green belt until all brown sites have been used. I strongly disagree with the core strategy for future development of Leeds – I don't agree that every wedge of Leeds should have some development occur within it when this means that brown sites remain unused in some parts of the city whilst in other wedges, green belt is being reclassified and built on. This strategy is immoral and abhorrent and shows no regard for our natural environment / sustainability.

Representation ID: REP00780 Question Ref: H2

I disagree that site 3455b should be 'green' for the following reasons:-there is a heavily used public footpath through the site - the site is not near a town / village centre and public transport links are poor – the nearest train station is several miles away and buses are infrequent-developing the site would undoubtedly increase traffic on Gamble Lane which has already been identified by local residents as hazardous due to current speed and frequency of vehicles that use it-the site is used by many local residents for exercising dogs; if the site is developed, dog owners will have to find an alternate location to exercise their dogs. The less responsible owners will have low inclination to do this, which would result in an increase in bored, frustrated and potentially aggressive dogs in the area. This could result in injury to other pets, livestock and people.-The site is green belt. I strongly disagree with the development of green belt until all brown sites have been used. I strongly disagree with the core strategy for future development of Leeds – I don't agree that every wedge of Leeds should have some development occur within it when this means that brown sites remain unused in some parts of the city whilst in other wedges, green belt is being reclassified and built on. This strategy is immoral and abhorrent and shows no regard for our natural environment / sustainability.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Charles Middleton

Representor No: PRS04270

Representation ID: REP00698 Question Ref: H1

THE AREA AS BEEN FARM LAND/GRASSING FOR HUNDREDS OF YEARS AND THE SURROUNDING ROADS ARE NOT UP TO A STANDARD THAT WILL ACCOMODATE EXTRA TRAFFIC AND IN MY OPINION WILL INCREASE THE RISK OF ACCIDENTS OR EVEN DEATHS IN THE SURROUNDING AREAS.FLOODING AS ALSO BEEN AN ISSUE TO OUR REAR GARDENS AND I AM SURE FURTHER HARD STANDINGS ON A PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WILL INCREASE THE RISK OF FLOODING.AS THE AREA INDICATED IS CALLED PARK SPRINGS AND THIS DOES MEAN MARSH LAND ANIMALS AND MAMMALS ARE PRESENT IN THE AREA INCLUDING NEWTS FROGS AND TOADS AND THE FIELD DIRECTLY BEHIND MY PROPERTY IS KNOWN LOCALLY AS BLUE BELL HILL AND DOES HAVE BLUE BELLS GROWING THERE AND ALSO OAK TREES ALONG WITH A MEDEVIL HEDGE ROW THAT HOSTS DIFFERING SPECIES OF BATS, IN MY OPINION THE AREA SHOULD BE DESIGNATED AT A SSSI AND IT WOULD BE A TRAVESTY TO BUILD ANY THING OTHER THAN FARM RELATED BUILDINGS IN THE AREA.I AM ALSO CONCERNED THAT A LARGE AREA BEHIND THE MAISONETTES AT THE GAMBLE LANE END OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WAS USED TO TIP CONTAMINATED WASTE DURING THE LATE 50'S AND EARLY 60'S, MY CONCERNS ARE THAT THE CAPPED OFF AREA'S WOULD BE DISTURBED AND AGAIN BE DISSASTEROUS TO THE ENVIRONMENT.I HAVE LIVED ON TONG DRIVE SINCE 1964 AND HAVE MORE LOCAL KNOLEDGE THAN MOST PEOPLE AND WOULD BE HORIFIED TO SEE ANY HOUSES BUILT ON A GREEN AREA OF BEUTY.YOURS CONCERNED CHARLES MIDDLETON.

Representation ID: REP00698 Question Ref: H2

THE SITE REFERANCE IS 3455B AND 3455A AND REASONS ARE AS ABOVE

Name: Ryszard Gorazda

Representor No: PRS04404

Representation ID: REP00225 Question Ref: H1

The sites identified (3455A&#amp;B) are not sustainable in planning terms and therefore will impact on existing houses and schools.

Representation ID: REP00225 Question Ref: H2

3455A 3455B - these are farms

Name: Melanie Harries

Representor No: PRS04590

Representation ID: REP00278 Question Ref: H14

The greenfield sites that I have commented on are not appropriate for elderly housing accommodation as they are not near amenities.

Representation ID: REP00278 Question Ref: H2

I disagree with Gamble Lane 3455A and 3455B planning requests for reasons stated above and also the traffic that uses Gamble Lane as a short cut is noisy and dangerous for children, this will increase vastly with the amount of houses that are proposed to be built. The amount of water that travels down Gamble Lane will increase as the trees and fields allow this to flow at a slower rate than if they were taken away, this would make the road treacherous in winter when the roads ice up. The greenfield sites make this a quieter place than most this close to the city centre, apart from the extra traffic we now get, and to take more green land away from Leeds would be a great shame.

Name: Andrew Wiggins

Representor No: PRS04622

Representation ID: REP00782 Question Ref: H1

Many of the 'green' sites are green belt. I strongly disagree with the development of green belt until all brown sites have been used. I strongly disagree with the core strategy for future development of Leeds – I don't agree that every wedge of Leeds should have some development occur within it when this means that brown sites remain unused in some parts of the city whilst in other wedges, green belt is being reclassified and built on. This strategy is immoral and abhorrent and shows no regard for our natural environment / sustainability.

Representation ID: REP00782 Question Ref: H2

Reasons site 3455b not suitable for housing development:-there is a heavily used public footpath through the site-the site provides natural habitat and feeding ground for rare and declining species including (but not limited to) red kites, hedgehogs, brown hares, bees and foxes-the site is not near a town / village centre and public transport links are poor – the nearest train station is several miles away and buses are infrequent-developing the site would undoubtedly increase traffic on Gamble Lane which has already been identified by local residents as hazardous due to current speed and frequency of vehicles that use it-the site is used by many local residents for exercising dogs; if the site is developed, dog owners will have to find an alternate location to exercise their dogs. The less responsible owners will have low inclination to do this, which would result in an increase in bored, frustrated and potentially aggressive dogs in the area. This could result in injury to other pets, livestock and people.-The site is green belt. I strongly disagree with the development of green belt until all brown sites have been used. I strongly disagree with the core strategy for future development of Leeds – I don't agree that every wedge of Leeds should have some development occur within it when this means that brown sites remain unused in some parts of the city whilst in other wedges, green belt is being reclassified and built on. This strategy is immoral and abhorrent and shows no regard for our natural environment / sustainability.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: John Barker

Representor No: PRS04721

Representation ID: REP01291 Question Ref: H12

No, the sites 3455A and 3455B are both totally inappropriate to develop in any capacity, especially for traveller sites due to access, the fact that these sites are public rights of way as well as the privacy issues previously stated as these sites over look and look onto current houses.

Representation ID: REP01291 Question Ref: H2

3455A and 3455B - I disagree with developing on these sites for the reasons already stated above. As these are green belt, the impact to local wildlife, the fact that developing on these fields will increase the risk of localised flooding, which Leeds City Council already spend millions on preventing. Both of these sites are also part of the Leeds Country Way and are public rights of way. Developing over these sites and reducing the number of areas for the cities residents to exercise and keep healthy. There are also privacy issues with these sites, especially site 3455A, as the field over looks the back of the houses on Hare Park Mount, and will look directly into residents property, including their bedrooms. The access these sites, especially 3455A is totally not appropriate. The access to site 3455A is narrow, winding and step county road, totally inappropriate for a housing development.

Name: Matthew Russell

Representor No: PRS04853

Representation ID: REP00638 Question Ref: H1

We dont believe the land the perspective areas to build on is sustainable

Representation ID: REP00638 Question Ref: H4

3455a as in previous statement we dont feel the potential allocated area is sustainable land in terms of planning.

Representation ID: REP00638 Question Ref: H5

3455B 3455BAs previous stated

Representation ID: REP00638 Question Ref: General comment

not at this time. although we would like to be kept up to date with the development for plans on 3455a and 3455b

Representation ID: REP00638 Question Ref: H2

3455B and 3455A.As above, in particular 3455a as the the land specified directly overlooks our property and on the basis the area is a public walk way

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: John Baron

Representor No: PRS04914

Representation ID: REP00048 Question Ref: H1

Specifically re green sites, I am concerned about 3455B and the loss of green belt land

Representation ID: REP06044 Question Ref: H1

I am writing to you to express concern about a potential threat to the Green Belt in Farnley and Wortley Ward.

As part of Leeds City Council's Your City Your Say consultation to identify new housing and employment land, I was concerned to see that a farmer's field off Gamble Lane and behind Hare Park Mount had been earmarked for potential housing. This is application 3455a.

I have a number of concerns about this.

Firstly it's the loss of beautiful and important greenbelt land, secondly the field is on a considerable slope and any housing development would overlook properties on Hare Park Mount and thirdly - and most importantly - the access down a narrow unlit country lane (ie the top half of Gamble Lane) is entirely inappropriate and inadequate.

We already have concerns about the speed of traffic coming down Gamble Lane, without adding more traffic to exacerbate this problem..

I'd also be concerned about the loss of wildlife hedges in the area. I regularly see bats in the field on an evening. The added noise coming from a new development would spoil what is currently a tranquil cul de sac.

Directly opposite on the other side of Gamble Lane lies a farmer's house and surrounding fields. This is proposed site 3455b.

Again, it's on greenbelt land, would have poor access on Gamble Lane and would also have access issues if its access was off the busy Tong Road. Interestingly a road through this site could give access to 3455a.

With both these proposed sites I feel there is insufficient access to public transport, shops, schools and services. I fear the local infrastructure is insufficient to cope.

Hare Park Mount residents are already talking about holding a public meeting to discuss these issues.

I do hope you'll be able to support my concerns over these proposals and that the residents of Hare Park Mount and the lower half of Gamble Lane can rely on your support in proposing allocating this land for housing?

I attach a photograph of site 3455a for your reference. Hare Park Mount is on the left of the photo.

Cllr John Hardy has also said he has concerns regarding the development of the sites.

Representation ID: REP00048 Question Ref: H7

3455a - because of loss of greenbelt land, loss of countryside hedges and potential loss of valuable trees near junction of Hare Park Mount and Gamble Lane. Also because of poor access onto narrow Gamble Lane, which is a country lane and will not take the pressure of extra traffic.

Difficult access onto Tong Road at top would push traffic towards going down Gamble Lane through residential area. There are already problems with speeding traffic down there. Existing properties on Hare Park Mount would be overlooked due to the sloping nature of the site. The site has problems with springs in wet weather. There's also a lack of local infrastructure to support it (ie shops, schools, NHS facilities in the community. Potential effects on potential property values.

Representation ID: REP00048 Question Ref: H12

NOT 3455a or 3455b due to access and infrastructure issues highlighted previously

Representation ID: REP00048 Question Ref: H2

3455B because of loss of greenbelt land. Also because of poor access onto Tong Road (a busy road at best of times) and increased traffic pressure on already busy Farnley Ring Road area, even worse access onto narrow Gamble Lane, which is a country lane. There's also a lack of local infrastructure to support it (ie shops, schools, NHS facilities.

Name: Trustees Of Brick Mill Estate

Representor No: PRS04950

Representation ID: REP06575 Question Ref: H1

Jones Lang LaSalle considers some sites are less suitable for Green Belt release than the land at Roker Lane site.

Reason why our site is comparable/better

3455B – poor accessibility

Representation ID: REP06575 Question Ref: H2

Why we consider some 'green' sites are not as suitable for consideration for allocating for future housing development as the Roker Lane site: 3455B - Poor accessibility. Accessibility is strong and available at the Roker Lane site.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Denise Mcdonald

Representor No: PRS05024

Representation ID: REP05590 Question Ref: H4

3445A/3455B

1. This is GREEN BELT LAND we do not require further housing we are getting to a point where there will be nothing left for future generations not to mention the wild life which is there. It will be a concrete getto also crime figures will go up.
2. The roads that already there are not maintained. Excess water from the land causes us flooding how that would be solved.
3. How would the traffic be monitored we have problems now. They come up Gamble Lane at 70-80 MPH discussion in the past have amounted to nothing.

Name: Ian Tempest Mitchell

Representor No: PRS05025

Representation ID: REP05591 Question Ref: H4

3455A/3455B

Traffic/council unable to do anything regarding speeds too much traffic. Excess water from land, causing flooding down Gamble Lane causing untold damage to existing properties.

This is GREEN BELT LAND we do not require more housing spoiling views and wildlife we are getting to a point where there will be nothing left for future generations.

Name: Ian Driver

Representor No: PRS05406

Representation ID: REP06011 Question Ref: H2

3455BGamble Lane, FarnleyLoss of Green Belt

Name: Joan Green

Representor No: PRS05428

Representation ID: REP06034 Question Ref: H1

I do not believe that this site is suitable for the following reasons:-

This site was a tip and has underground gas's checked on a periodic basis to ensure the gas release pipes are still clear and the gas has a way of being released, this is something which I know comes up on surveys as "making it a high risk when purchasing houses"

There is an underground stream (constant water flow)which leads to a well at the top of our garden. The water drainage from the fields is excessive. If the fields/trees are not there, this WILL increase water to Water Lane/Gamble Lane and the junction of Butt Lane/Tong Road. All these areas already have issues with water drainage and ice in winter periods, increasing chances of accidents to drivers/pedestrians/current residents

Representation ID: REP06034 Question Ref: H1

I disagree for following reasons:-

Currently the traffics levels on Gamble lane are already high, we have had a number of accidents pulling off the drive, the risk of this will be increased if plans of 340 extra houses go ahead.

Currently this is green belt land, and brings all the benefits (bats, foxes, deer, herons, water life) which will all be lost if the plans go ahead

We purchased this house on the basis that it was a high risk area due to the gas's/tip/water - etc and were advised that due to the tip, building would never happen. This is a major concern, what will be impact be to us if the plans go ahead with gas's etc.

Invasion of privacy and increased noise pollution to those already in residence, who purchased to live in "green belt areas"

Representation ID: REP06034 Question Ref: H1

I disagree for following reasons:-

Currently the traffics levels on Gamble lane are already high, we have had a number of accidents pulling off the drive, the risk of this will be increased if plans of 340 extra houses go ahead.

Currently this is green belt land, and brings all the benefits (bats, foxes, deer, herons, water life) which will all be lost if the plans go ahead

Invasion of privacy and increased noise pollution to those already in residence.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Barratt & David Wilson Homes Yorkshire West

Representor No: PRS05643

Representation ID: REP06767 Question Ref: H1

3455B

We support the rating of site reference 3455B as Green (sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing). However we object to the rating of site reference 3455A as Amber (sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as Green sites). We believe both sites 3455A and 3455B should be collectively allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

Conclusions

The promotional document submitted to Leeds City Council in February 2013 is attached [see original rep]. This includes a Masterplan which has an indicative capacity for over 230 dwellings, including open space and links to the open countryside. There are no major physical constraints on either site and the development of the two sites could deliver a range of benefits:

- 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

The sites have strong links to the urban area and are well contained by physical and natural features. Both sites are ideal candidates for allocation as their release would have a limited impact on Green Belt purposes, are in a sustainable location and in an area where the Council is encouraging growth. Farnley is in the Outer West housing market area which has a housing requirement of 4,700 dwellings and is within the Main Urban Area which is expected to accommodate 33,300 dwellings. The sites are close to bus stops which provide regular services into Leeds city centre. The sites are also well located in relation to local shops and services, schools and health facilities. 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 of 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 we support the housing allocation of this site and consider that it should all be given a 'Green' rating.

Site 3455B is a greenfield site, between Gamble Lane, Tong Road and Tong Drive. Included within the site, but not within the control of Barratt Homes is Mount Pleasant which are a small collection of farm buildings and farm house. To the north and south of the site is further agricultural land, and residential development off Tong Drive immediately abuts the site to the east.

Site 3455A is a sloping, greenfield site. It is bounded to the south by Gamble Lane, west and north by field boundaries and east by residential development on Hare Park Mount.

Both sites are currently designated as Green Belt and as a Special Landscape Area and Urban Fringe Priority Area in the Leeds UDP Review 2006. Both sites are on the western edge of the built up area of Farnley which lies within the Main Urban Area. In terms of local services, there are a range of services near the site. This includes a Sainsburys Local, Lloyds Pharmacy and Fish and Chip shop, 800m away at the Tong Road and Ring Road Junction. There is also a Post Office, convenience store, hairdressers, betting shop and takeaways 750m away at the roundabout between Henconner Lane and Pudsey Road. The closest large supermarket to the sites is Morrisons, 1.3km away on Swinnow Road followed by Tesco on Upper Town Street 2.3km away and ASDA at the Owlcoates Centre, 2.9km away. The site is near to public transport, education and health facilities. The site is approximately 1.5km away from Bramley Train Station where there are regular services to Leeds, Bradford, Huddersfield and Manchester Victoria. There are bus stops on Water Lane, approximately 400m from the sites where the hourly Number 80 service can be accessed, which is the Old Farnley to Bramley Shopping Centre Circular. There are also bus stops on Butt Lane and Farnley Ring Road approximately 600m from the site where the following bus services can be accessed:

- 5 – Halton Moor to Old Farnley via Leeds every 20 minutes
- 62 – Cross Green to Greengates via Saxton Gardens, Leeds, Armley and Pudsey every 30 minutes
- 711 – Bradford to the White Rose Centre via Old Farnley, Wortley and Pudsey every hour

The site is near local educational facilities. The nearest primary schools are Ryecroft Primary School which is 800m from the sites, Park Spring Primary School which is 880m away and Greenhill Primary School which is 890m away. The nearest secondary schools are The Farnley Academy which is 1.2km away, Swallow Hill Community College which is 1.7km away and Crawshaw School which is 1.7km away in nearby Pudsey. The site is also near to local health facilities. The closest GPs to the sites are Beach Tree Medical Centre on Henconner Lane, a distance of 750m away, The Gables Surgery on Swinnow Road, 1.6km away and Highfield Medical Centre on Highfield Road, 1.7km away. The two closest dental surgeries are Xen Smiles Limited, 720m away and Bramley Dental Care, 1.5km away. There are a number of pharmacies and opticians near the sites, the closest pharmacy being 760m away on Tong Road and opticians 2.3km away in Bramley.

Policy

The allocation of site 3455 for housing development is consistent with the adopted National Planning Policy Framework. The objectives of the Framework include building a strong, competitive economy, promoting sustainable transport and delivering a wide choice of high quality homes. The development at Gamble Lane is consistent with these objectives. The National Planning Policy Framework states at Paragraph 80 that the Green Belt serves five purposes. The table below assesses this site in relation to these purposes:

To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas: Both sites (A and B) are well connected to the built up area and the eastern boundary of both sites is residential. Development of this site would not lead to ribbon development and would not result in isolated development. Development of these sites would round off the western edge of Farnley.

Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another: Development of site 3455B would not lead to neighbouring towns merging into one another as it is bounded by Gamble Lane, Tong Road and residential development. Development of site 3455A would not lead to inappropriate merging of neighbouring towns given the potential for this site to include a strong landscape buffer to the west to form a defensible Green Belt boundary.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Barratt & David Wilson Homes Yorkshire West

Representor No: PRS05643

To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment: The development of this land to the north 3455A and south 3455B of Gamble Lane offers the potential to create a defensible Green Belt boundary, bound by existing roads and a strong landscape buffer. The development of the site offers opportunities to the wider community with additional pedestrian links to the open countryside to the west.

To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns: Sites A and B are not within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature. Development of both sites would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features.

To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land: Spatial Policy 1 of the Core Strategy advises that an appropriate balance of greenfield and brownfield land will be necessary to deliver the spatial development strategy. There are a few derelict and brownfield sites within the Outer West Market Area; therefore the development of greenfield sites will be necessary in order to meet the housing requirement in the draft Core Strategy.

Core Strategy Spatial Policy 6 The Housing Requirement and Allocation of Housing Land sets out that the allocation of housing land is based on criteria such as sustainable locations which meet the standards of public transport accessibility, the least impact on Green Belt purposes and avoiding areas of flood risk. The development of this site accords with this draft policy. Both sites are on the edge of the Leeds Bradford Corridor Regeneration Priority Area as defined in the draft Core Strategy. Focus is placed upon opportunities for growth within Regeneration Priority Areas as set out in Spatial Policy 4. The Leeds Bradford Corridor aims to release the economic potential of the area to the west of Leeds city centre and achieve better transport connections between the two cities. This programme is to focus on four key areas:- housing, improvement, improved food, cycle, rail and road access, improvements to green infrastructure, and increased business competitiveness and growth. The development of both sites would provide investment in the area, deliver a proposition of affordable housing and new greenspace.

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 (5%) as extensions. The housing distribution by housing market characteristic area for the Outer West is 4,700 which is 7% of the total housing requirement for the Leeds district. Given the emphasis on development in or on the edge of the Main Urban Area it can be expected that this site, on the edge of the Main Urban Area, and close to facilities performs well against this policy and should be allocated to meet help meet the housing requirement in this housing market area. In the Outer West housing market area the Draft Core Strategy apportions 4,700 dwellings as being required throughout the plan period. Regardless of our objections to the overall housing requirement, the Outer West has outstanding permissions and allocations equating to 1,728 dwellings, this is only 37% of the requirement. The total number of 'Green' sites in this housing market area has a capacity for 1,705 dwellings, some 36% of the requirement. Based on this it is clear that the Council will have to allocate all of the identified sites in the Outer West housing market area in order to achieve the dwelling requirement. The Allocations draft document identifies Amber sites with a capacity of 1,860 dwellings. Based on the draft apportioned requirement to this housing market area, over 68% of the identified Amber sites will be required in order to meet the requirement. It would be logical to include complete site 3455 as a Green, suitable site, rather than splitting the site into A and B.

In the Leeds City Council Site Assessment, reference is made to the site 3455A's transport issues and distance from local services. It states that the site has no public transport or local services within walking distance. The LCC standard is that sites should be within a 5 min walk to a bus stop offering a direct 15 min frequency service. In reality, this site is within walking distance to bus services, it being within 400m of bus stops on Water Lane and within 600m of bus stops on Butt Lane and Farnley Ring Road. Furthermore, the development of this site offers the potential to create additional bus services to further improve the accessibility of the site. LCC also score the site negatively in terms of access on the grounds of Gamble Lane being a narrow country road with no footways or lighting, and trees or stone walling on both sides, therefore making it unsuitable for access. The developer is proposing to change the current road layout of Gamble Lane. This will require drivers to drive through the development and integrate both sites into the existing built up area. The positive elements that the Council reference relate to the area being well contained by woodland with strong links to the urban area. This will be further improved by the road layout alterations.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Julie Parker

Representor No: PRS05900

Representation ID: REP06649 Question Ref: H1

3455B

I am writing to submit my opposition to the site allocation plans for sites 3455A & 3455B, which are currently open for consultation.

I do not believe that this site is suitable for the following reasons:-

- underground streams running from various sources on Gamble Lane. If the trees/green belt land is taken away, the water from the fields will increase and effect local residents by way further water into properties.
- Increased water in the local drainage system, which is already problematic and feeds into the reservoir and local water systems.
- Impact on local schools and service will be impacted, increased properties means new surgeries/school
- Risk of further sprawl to adjoining green belt fields
- Currently the area is very quiet and private – 170 houses on this field will increase the noise pollution and will result in damage to the local wildlife. It will also increase traffic to already busy roads, such as Tong Road and Gamble Lane – which already have speeding issues.

Representation ID: REP06649 Question Ref: H2

3455B

I disagree for following reasons:-

- Reduction in privacy to local residents
- Traffic levels on both Gamble Lane and Tong Road are already high and speed is particularly and issue coming out onto Gamble Lane from Hare Park Mount – due to speed of traffic, icy roads (due to over surface water) which will only get worse if plans of 170/340 extra houses go ahead.
- Green belt land - with the nature and feel of countryside - the new properties will change the look and feel of the area and impact on nature and usage. i.e Deer/Foxes/Public footpaths /Equestrian. There is a lot of equestrian usage in this area and the changes would result in this dropping due to again the road safely and lack of countryside.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Kirsty And Tim Thornton

Representor No: PRS05902

Representation ID: REP06917 Question Ref: H1

H2 – No – 3455B . Gamble Lane Farnley, LS12 5LN

Reason - The site is located in a rural location with narrow country lanes and with no footways or lighting. The SHLAA assessment makes reference that the site is adjacent to main roads but also highlights poor accessibility. Development of the site would lead to increased traffic on totally unsuitable roads to the detriment of highway safety or large amounts of roads improvements to the detriment of the visual appearance of the special landscaped area and green belt.

Sustainability – the site has no public transport or local services within walking distance and would rely on a private car for access. It is therefore not considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF. Other sites should be sought.

Representation ID: REP06918 Question Ref: H1

No –

Reason – this is a green belt and specialist landscape area and is therefore subject to local and national control. This policy requires a release of land only in exceptional circumstances and subject to a review to ensure other non green belt sites have been considered first. We feel the council has carried out a select review of green belt locations (as we have heard from local farmer [x] in person that some of his land has not been considered as an alternative), which he feels is more suitable. Therefore on what basis has this selection review taken place? Why have the council not carried out a full review of all green belt sites or a growth assessment?

Representation ID: REP06918 Question Ref: H1

Objections to planning permission of site 3455B, Gamble Lane Farnley, LS12 5LN

We are writing to formally object in the strongest possible terms to the proposals and ongoing consultation on site 3455B (Green), Gamble Lane Farnley, LS12 5LN

Having recently gone through planning permission to convert [x], considering how stringent the conditions were, we are appalled that the above sites would even be considered for development in the Sire Allocations Plan Volume 2: 11 Outer West, June 2013.

We object also to the core strategy that spreads out development across Leeds, regardless of whether the sites are protected Green belt sites, where other Brown field sites may remain unused (just to satisfy the core strategy!)

We have also objected online.

Our main concerns are :-

- Site 3455B has been close to Landfill and during our building process, we had to provide dangerous gas reports to ensure there were no emissions still from the land. As our build requested a solid concrete sub floor to safeguard from any concerns.
- Preservation of local nature. We conducted a bat survey in line with our planning conditions, and the fields were identified as popular bat flight paths. Exerts from the report include 'There are also many birds (starlings, sparrows and wrens) foxes, countless species of butterflies. During the daytime survey in addition to feral pigeons, small birds including sparrow and wren were observed. By including sparrow terraces this would maintain and enhance biodiversity and meet requirements under section 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 by the opportunity to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments' . The full report is available on request.
- Loss of Farmland. Simon Kellett currently farms on the sites identified, and values site 3455B particularly as good quality farm land. We are aware he has offered an alternative site for consideration. The site is located on Agricultural Lane of grade 3a or above. Such agriculturally rich land should be retained and other lesser sites considered instead.
- The public footpath (number 160) is frequently used with dogs and would be a great loss to the Ramblers Association. Accommodating these ramblers was a condition of our own planning consent.
- Loss of privacy. This site is elevated and any new buildings would directly overlook our property. This would cause a loss of privacy, daylight, sunlight and cause light pollution. As a planning condition for our building we had to be very specific about design, appearance and materials used. Meeting these requirements was a huge financial burden. This proposal is a direct contradiction to all the restrictions imposed on us.
- Increased traffic. As part of our planning conditions, we were instructed to carry out a traffic survey for the additional usage of the existing opening for two more cars (from a building that already existed). The council highways department expressed concern for added traffic flow for one dwelling. The prospect of adding a potential 170 (and therefore a possible 340 cars) in the same area is quite frankly ridiculous. The road network is totally unsuitable and would also be dangerous.
- Loss of protected green belt. This particular green belt saves the local 'countryside' from encroachment, and preserves the setting and characteristics of local area boundaries such as Wortley, Farnley, Pudsey and Bramley, and prevents these neighbouring towns from merging into one another!

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Kirsty And Tim Thornton

Representor No: PRS05902

Representation ID: REP06917 Question Ref: H1

We are writing to formally object in the strongest possible terms to the proposals and ongoing consultation on sites 3455A (amber) and 3455B (Green), Gamble Lane Farnley, LS12 5LN

Having recently gone through planning permission to convert Mount Pleasant Barn, considering how stringent the conditions were, we are appalled that the above sites would even be considered for development in the Sire Allocations Plan Volume 2: 11 Outer West, June 2013. We object also to the core strategy that spreads out development across Leeds, regardless of whether the sites are protected Green belt sites, where other Brown field sites may remain unused (just to satisfy the core strategy!)

We have also objected online.

Our main concerns are :-

- Site 3455B has been close to Landfill and during our building process, we had to provide dangerous gas reports to ensure there were no emissions still from the land. As our build requested a solid concrete sub floor to safeguard from any concerns.
- Preservation of local nature. We conducted a bat survey in line with our planning conditions, and the fields were identified as popular bat flight paths. Exerts from the report include 'There are also many birds (starlings, sparrows and wrens) foxes, countless species of butterflies. During the daytime survey in addition to feral pigeons, small birds including sparrow and wren were observed. By including sparrow terraces this would maintain and enhance biodiversity and meet requirements under section 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 by the opportunity to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments'. The full report is available on request.
- Loss of Farmland. Simon Kellett currently farms on the sites identified, and values site 3455B particularly as good quality farm land. We are aware he has offered an alternative site for consideration. The site is located on Agricultural Lane of grade 3a or above. Such agriculturally rich land should be retained and other lesser sites considered instead.
- The public footpath (number 160) is frequently used with dogs and would be a great loss to the Ramblers Association. Accommodating these ramblers was a condition of our own planning consent.
- Loss of privacy. This site is elevated and any new buildings would directly overlook our property. This would cause a loss of privacy, daylight, sunlight and cause light pollution. As a planning condition for our building we had to be very specific about design, appearance and materials used. Meeting these requirements was a huge financial burden. This proposal is a direct contradiction to all the restrictions imposed on us.
- Increased traffic. As part of our planning conditions, we were instructed to carry out a traffic survey for the additional usage of the existing opening for two more cars (from a building that already existed). The council highways department expressed concern for added traffic flow for one dwelling. The prospect of adding a potential 170 (and therefore a possible 340 cars) in the same area is quite frankly ridiculous. The road network is totally unsuitable and would also be dangerous.
- Loss of protected green belt. This particular green belt saves the local 'countryside' from encroachment, and preserves the setting and characteristics of local area boundaries such as Wortley, Farnley, Pudsey and Bramley, and prevents these neighbouring towns from merging into one another!

Conclusion – We urge the council to consider other sites as the two discussed are entirely unsuitable.

Representation ID: REP06650 Question Ref: H1

We are writing to formally object in the strongest possible terms to the proposals and ongoing consultation on sites 3455A (amber) and 3455B (Green), Gamble Lane Farnley, LS12 5LN

This is a green belt and specialist landscape area and is therefore subject to local and national control. This policy requires a release of land only in exceptional circumstances and subject to a review to ensure other non green belt sites have been considered first. We feel the council has carried out a select review of green belt locations (as we have heard from local farmer Simon Kellett in person that some of his land has not been considered as an alternative), which he feels is more suitable. Therefore on what basis has this selection review taken place? Why have the council not carried out a full review of all green belt sites or a growth assessment?

Our main concerns are :-

- Site 3455B has been close to Landfill and during our building process, we had to provide dangerous gas reports to ensure there were no emissions still from the land. As our build requested a solid concrete sub floor to safeguard from any concerns.
- Preservation of local nature. We conducted a bat survey in line with our planning conditions, and the fields were identified as popular bat flight paths. Exerts from the report include 'There are also many birds (starlings, sparrows and wrens) foxes, countless species of butterflies. During the daytime survey in addition to feral pigeons, small birds including sparrow and wren were observed. By including sparrow terraces this would maintain and enhance biodiversity and meet requirements under section 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 by the opportunity to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments'. The full report is available on request.
- Loss of Farmland. Simon Kellett currently farms on the sites identified, and values site 3455B particularly as good quality farm land. We are aware he has offered an alternative site for consideration. The site is located on Agricultural Lane of grade 3a or above. Such agriculturally rich land should be retained and other lesser sites considered instead.
- The public footpath (number 160) is frequently used with dogs and would be a great loss to the Ramblers Association. Accommodating these ramblers was a condition of our own planning consent.
- Loss of privacy. This site is elevated and any new buildings would directly overlook our property. This would cause a loss of privacy, daylight, sunlight and cause light pollution. As a planning condition for our building we had to be very specific about design, appearance and materials used. Meeting these requirements was a huge financial burden. This proposal is a direct contradiction to all the restrictions imposed on us.
- Increased traffic. As part of our planning conditions, we were instructed to carry out a traffic survey for the additional usage of the existing opening for two more cars (from a building that already existed). The council highways department expressed concern for added traffic flow for one dwelling. The prospect of adding a potential 170 (and therefore a possible 340 cars) in the same area is quite frankly ridiculous. The road network is totally unsuitable and would also be dangerous.
- Loss of protected green belt. This particular green belt saves the local 'countryside' from encroachment, and preserves the setting and characteristics of local area boundaries such as Wortley, Farnley, Pudsey and Bramley, and prevents these neighbouring towns from merging into one another!

Conclusion – We urge the council to consider other sites as the two discussed are entirely unsuitable.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Kirsty And Tim Thornton

Representor No: PRS05902

Representation ID: REP06918 Question Ref: H2

No – 3455B . Gamble Lane Farnley, LS12 5LN

Reason - The site is located in a rural location with narrow country lanes and with no footways or lighting. The SHLAA assessment makes reference that the site is adjacent to main roads but also highlights poor accessibility. Development of the site would lead to increased traffic on totally unsuitable roads to the detriment of highway safety or large amounts of roads improvements to the detriment of the visual appearance of the special landscaped area and green belt.

Representation ID: REP06650 Question Ref: H2

No – 3455B . Gamble Lane Farnley, LS12 5LN

Reason - The site is located in a rural location with narrow country lanes and with no footways or lighting. The SHLAA assessment makes reference that the site is adjacent to main roads but also highlights poor accessibility. Development of the site would lead to increased traffic on totally unsuitable roads to the detriment of highway safety or large amounts of roads improvements to the detriment of the visual appearance of the special landscaped area and green belt.

Sustainability – the site has no public transport or local services within walking distance and would rely on a private car for access. It is therefore not considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF. Other sites should be sought.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Tim Madden

Representor No: PRS06038

Representation ID: REP06870 Question Ref: H1

I write in response to your consultation on the allocation of housing in the Leeds District. I accept the need for adequate supplies of new housing in the district in order to provide suitable and affordable housing for Leeds residents, to support the growth and economic vitality of the city. Any new housing site however has to be in line with national, regional and local planning policy, be sustainable and not put undue pressure on the existing infrastructure.

I refer to your current consultation exercise and would like to comment on two specific sites in the Farnley and Wortley Area.

Site 3455A - Gamble Lane Farnley

This site is coloured pink on the plan.

Policy – The site is located in Green Belt and Special Landscape Area subject to national and local control. This policy requires the release of land only in exceptional circumstance and subject to a review to ensure that other none green belt sites have been considered first.

I note the Council has carried out a selective review of Green Belt locations. On what basis has this selective review of sites taken place? Why have the council not carried out a full review of all Green Belt sites or a Growth Assessment.

Access – The site is located in a rural location with narrow country lanes and with no footways or lighting. Development of the site would lead to increased traffic on unsuitable roads to the detriment of highway safety or large amounts of road improvements to the detriment of the visual appearance of the Special Landscape Area and Green Belt.

Green Belt - The site currently assists in preventing the merging of settlements and checking unrestricted sprawl of the built up area. It therefore conforms to the national policy for Green Belt and its development for housing would be contrary to the NPPF and seriously detrimental to the Green Belt in this location

Farmland – The site is located on Agricultural Lane of Grade 3a or above. Such viable and agriculturally rich land should be retained and other lesser site considered in advance of it.

Sustainability – The site has no public transport or local services within walking distance and would rely on the private car for access. It is therefore not considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF other sites should be sought.

Conclusion - Site 3455A – Gamble Lane is not suitable for housing development due to its poor access, location in the Green Belt and Special Landscape Area, high Grade agricultural land and unsustainable position. Other more suitable sites should be considered ahead of it and it should be removed from the list of sites at this stage.

Site 3455B – Gamble Lane, Farnley

The site is coloured green on the plan

Policy – The site is located in Green Belt and Special Landscape Area subject to

national and local control. This policy requires the release of land only in exceptional circumstance and subject to a review to ensure that other none green belt sites have been considered first.

I note the Council has carried out a selective review of Green Belt locations. On what basis has this selective review of sites taken place? Why have the council not carried out a full review of all Green Belt sites or a Growth Assessment.

Access – The site is located in a rural location with narrow country lanes and with no footways or lighting. The SHLAA Assessment notes that the site is adjacent to main roads but notes poor accessibility. Development of the site would lead to increased traffic on unsuitable roads to the detriment of highway safety or large amounts of road improvements to the detriment of the visual appearance of the Special Landscape Area and Green Belt.

Green Belt - The site currently assists in preventing the merging of settlements and checking unrestricted sprawl of the built up area. It therefore conforms to the national policy for Green Belt and its development for housing would be contrary to the NPPF and seriously detrimental to the Green Belt in this location

Farmland – The site is located on Agricultural Lane of Grade 3a or above. Such viable and agriculturally rich land should be retained and other lesser site considered in advance of it. The site contains farm buildings which continue to be in agricultural use and development would lead to the loss of a viable farm unit.

Sustainability – The site has no public transport or local services within walking distance and would rely on the private car for access. It is therefore not considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF other sites should be sought.

Conclusion - Site 3455B – Gamble Lane is not suitable for housing development due to its poor access, location in the Green Belt and Special Landscape Area, high Grade agricultural land, viable farm unit and unsustainable position. Other more suitable sites should be considered ahead of it and it should be removed

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Tim Madden

Representor No: PRS06038

from the list of sites at this stage.

Name: Josie Madden

Representor No: PRS06051

Representation ID: REP06895 Question Ref: H1

Site 3455B

Site 3455B – Gamble Lane, Farnley

The site is coloured green on the plan

Policy – The site is located in Green Belt and Special Landscape Area subject to national and local control. This policy requires the release of land only in exceptional circumstance and subject to a review to ensure that other none green belt sites have been considered first.

I note the Council has carried out a selective review of Green Belt locations. On what basis has this selective review of sites taken place? Why have the council not carried out a full review of all Green Belt sites or a Growth Assessment.

Access – The site is located in a rural location with narrow country lanes and with no footways or lighting. The SHLAA Assessment notes that the site is adjacent to main roads but notes poor accessibility. Development of the site would lead to increased traffic on unsuitable roads to the detriment of highway safety or large amounts of road improvements to the detriment of the visual appearance of the Special Landscape Area and Green Belt.

Green Belt - The site currently assists in preventing the merging of settlements and checking unrestricted sprawl of the built up area. It therefore conforms to the national policy for Green Belt and its development for housing would be contrary to the NPPF and seriously detrimental to the Green Belt in this location

Farmland – The site is located on Agricultural Lane of Grade 3a or above. Such viable and agriculturally rich land should be retained and other lesser site considered in advance of it. The site contains farm buildings which continue to be in agricultural use and development would lead to the loss of a viable farm unit.

Sustainability – The site has no public transport or local services within walking distance and would rely on the private car for access. It is therefore not considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF other sites should be sought.

Conclusion - Site 3455B – Gamble Lane is not suitable for housing development due to its poor access, location in the Green Belt and Special Landscape Area, high Grade agricultural land, viable farm unit and unsustainable position. Other more suitable sites should be considered ahead of it and it should be removed from the list of sites at this stage.

Name: Gaunts Limited And I Driver

Representor No: PRS06552

Representation ID: REP07763 Question Ref: H2

3455B Gamble Lane, Farnley: Loss of Green Belt

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 3455B

Housing

Land off Gamble Lane

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 4082

Housing

Windlesford Green Hostel, Woodlesford

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS02845

Representation ID: REP05398 Question Ref: H14

Windlesford Green Hostel, Woodlesford. Brownfield site which could accommodate housing or care facility.

Name: D.j Cove

Representor No: PRS05192

Representation ID: REP06611 Question Ref: H7

4082 - Agree with Green

We support this site being allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

We agree with the "green" classification. The site might be suitable for housing elderly persons. The site has good access, located adjacent to a regular bus service and is close to local amenities. It is a sustainable housing site.

Name: The Oulton Society

Representor No: PRS06345

Representation ID: REP07323 Question Ref: H1

4082 Agree Green - see submitted representation for full details

Windlesford Green Hostel, Woodlesford . Brownfield site which could accommodate housing or care facility.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: TLC056

Retail

Rothwell

Name: Morrisons Supermarkets Plc

Representor No: PRS06404

Representation ID: REP07479 Question Ref: R1

With reference to the above, and on behalf of our clients, Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ('Morrisons'), we write to thank you for providing us with the opportunity to comment on the Leeds Site Allocations Issues and Options Development Plan Document.

Morrisons is a major food and grocery retailer who operate 11 foodstores in Leeds, with all but one being located within existing defined town centres. These stores perform a key role in generating a significant amount of activity and pedestrian flows, which helps to maintain the overall vitality and viability of the centres they serve. Morrisons also have a pending application (with a resolution to grant) for a new foodstore on an in-centre site at Chapel Allerton (LPA ref: 12/00822/FU). Our client would like to make comments on the above document to ensure the vitality and viability of the defined centres in Leeds.

Plan 8.2 A: Rothwell - we support the inclusion of the Morrisons foodstore within the Proposed Primary Shopping Area Boundary

We would be grateful if Peacock and Smith are kept informed on further stages in the preparation of Local Development Framework documents

Representation ID: REP07478 Question Ref: R1

With reference to the above, and on behalf of our clients, Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ('Morrisons'), we write to thank you for providing us with the opportunity to comment on the Leeds Site Allocations Issues and Options Development Plan Document.

Morrisons is a major food and grocery retailer who operate 11 foodstores in Leeds, with all but one being located within existing defined town centres. These stores perform a key role in generating a significant amount of activity and pedestrian flows, which helps to maintain the overall vitality and viability of the centres they serve. Morrisons also have a pending application (with a resolution to grant) for a new foodstore on an in-centre site at Chapel Allerton (LPA ref: 12/00822/FU). Our client would like to make comments on the above document to ensure the vitality and viability of the defined centres in Leeds.

Plan 8.2 A: Rothwell - we support the inclusion of the Morrisons foodstore within the Proposed Primary Shopping Area Boundary

We would be grateful if Peacock and Smith are kept informed on further stages in the preparation of Local Development Framework documents.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2201750

Employment

Pontefract Road Rothwell

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08090 Question Ref: E3

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South area.]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 2201970

Employment

Adj Dunford House Green Lane Methley Ls26

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08090 Question Ref: General comment

[NB Sites 2103651, 2200840, 2103650 are all in Aire Valley]

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:
- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South area.]

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 148

Greenspace

Rothwell Country Park

Name: Mark Jones

Representor No: PRS06012

Representation ID: REP06842 Question Ref: G1

I support the inclusion of Site 148 as natural green space for reasons I set out later. I am concerned that Leeds City Council (LCC) have said that this site could be a potential housing site because it would be contained by the park to the north. This park is the Rothwell Country Park that is currently allocated in the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006 (U DP) as a Local Nature Area and is being proposed by LCC as a Natural Greenspace (which I support). Recently LCC have spent considerable amounts of money enhancing the Park by introducing a 'Trim Trail' demonstrating how popular and how well used this local asset is. It also signifies how important LCC (as a whole- not just the planning department) consider this site to be.

Along with its ecological benefits, one of the fundamental and unique characteristics of the RCP is its topography, as it comprises of a very large hill. This means that it is a very prominent, visible and elevated area of land. Its height means that when standing on top of it, people have panoramic views of Leeds and there are a number of high buildings within Leeds City Centre from which you can see a large part of the RCP. The views from the bridleway, other surrounding footpaths and from the RCP itself would be severely harmed by any housing located on Site 12598. The bulk and massing of such development at the foot of the hill adjacent to the RCP would have a devastating visual impact on the setting and character of it and it would be very visible from the public footpaths and bridleways adjoining it.

RCP is a very important nature site that needs protecting. It comprises of an extensive network of paths including a 'sculpture trail ' and 'pond trail ' and in 2010 the Friends of Rothwell Country Park were set up to help manage the park for both people and wildlife.

It is accessed from the Trans-Pennine Cycle Way and is located adjacent to the Aire and Calder Navigation Canal. It is part of a corridor of green spaces in the Lower Aire Valley that is owned by Leeds City Council and managed in partnership with the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust.

In addition to the above mentioned, there is currently a strong defensible boundary between Site 1259B and the built up area to the south. A fundamental part of the existing strong boundary is the public footpath which benefits from well established trees and hedgerows, is very popular and is well used to gain access to the RCP.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1098

Greenspace

Sugar Hill

Name: R Knowles

Representor No: PRS06663

Representation ID: REP07888 Question Ref: G1

The boundary changes are not supported insofar as 1098 has been considered as a possible extension of greenspace in terms of land and its amenity value. This land is not green, not publicly accessible (only 4x4 vehicles can enter) and of no value. It should not be considered suitable. 5.21 Our client therefore would object to the land ever being considered as amenity greenspace without first there being development on a portion of the site for housing and commercial uses.

Representation ID: REP07888 Question Ref: G3

The land subject to this representation should be supported in terms of its development. The Council currently considers that there is a shortfall in land for amenity and outdoor sports within the Rothwell area.

5.23 The Masterplan as contained within Appendix 1 identifies that this shortfall can be reduced if a housing and commercial development were supported.

5.24 The fact here is that the development as proposed would therefore assist the Local Authority in delivering its strategy of enhancing greenspace in the local area.

Representation ID: REP07888 Question Ref: G5

See submitted representation for full details.

Site 1098 is of poor quality. The development of the site would result in the investment on the land itself.

5.26 Therefore if housing and other commercial uses were supported on the site it is the case that the site would be self-regenerating, and thus open space, both of amenity value and also sports pitches would be delivered without having to look elsewhere.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1100

Greenspace

Rothwell Sports Centre

Name: Roy Johnson

Representor No: PRS03060

Representation ID: REP02086 Question Ref: G1

The current greenspace in Garforth should remain as it is. Over the years more and more of the space has been built on and Garforth has now been expanded to capacity. Sites including 3112/3111/1100/1044/3113/3114/2156/1165 would significantly impact on Town End which is already a bottle neck at peak times. The building of 4500 houses would put a huge strain on a sewage and drainage system that cannot cope at present and this would cause further flooding throughout Garforth. I was born in Garforth in the mid 50s and have seen the green areas of Garforth disappear over the years. As a child I played with my friends in Bluebell Woods and this disappeared when Wimpey built what was, at that time, the largest housing estate in Europe. For many years planning was refused for Garforth Cliff due to the drainage issues, but this has now been granted despite the traffic congestion that is going to cause to an already busy road. Building on greenspace has an impact on the natural habitat of wild life and wild flowers. The boundary of Garforth is gradually disappear and be merged in to Swillington. The demand for all local services - schools, doctors, dentists, policing and fire services would be pushed beyond capacity.

Name: David Rushforth

Representor No: PRS03381

Representation ID: REP00880 Question Ref: G1

My comments relate to site references 1044, 1100, 3111, 3112 and 3113 in the Leeds Site Allocation Plan volume 2 - 9 Outer South East. I have a number of concerns and would make the following observations: You should not be considering the need for any Travellers sites in the Outer South East area of the city. The proposed extension of Cottingley Springs more than adequately covers the council in terms of provision for that community I also wish to comment on land that for various reasons I consider absolutely unsuitable and inappropriate. Land on Wakefield Road currently coded 3112 and 3111. This property is currently coded amber. I reject the idea that expansion to the North West of Garforth is a good the proposal breaches the town's natural border so with more suitable land available I would consider this to be unnecessary. The impact on the A642 in terms of traffic movement would be immense and would create an unacceptable bottleneck at Town End which is already above capacity for much of the day. Also Wakefield Road has an open beck which on occasion has, if not stopped, certainly mitigated the massive flooding risk that affects West Garforth. There is also a great selection of wildlife to consider at this area. I suggest that 3112 and 3111 are turned to red coding in the final allocation plan. Moving up the Wakefield Road to parcels of land coded 1100, 1044 and 3113 I would suggest that in terms of housing this land is also made red for exactly the same set of reasons outlined for 3112 and 3111. Please note that in terms of 1044 the Council are already working to deliver car park provision at Town End and therefore reject any need for further car park provision at this location. Moving onto land off Barwick Road at 3114 and 2156 I understand Persimmon have already expressed a desire to build up to 900 units at this location. This would be utter folly as the only way into Garforth would be up Barwick Road under a single lane railway bridge only then to encounter what would be a massive traffic pinch point at town end and indeed the same argument applies to any development on Wakefield Road. Add into the equation the units already being delivered at 822. This would create nothing short of gridlock. I strongly urge therefore that 3114, 1165 and 2156 go from amber to red. I am comfortable that the land adjacent at 3115 is and should remain red.

Name: Jean Coutts

Representor No: PRS04124

Representation ID: REP01748 Question Ref: G1

We already suffer with flooding sewage drainage problems on Wakefield Road Garforth Site Ref. 1044/1100/3112/3111/3113. and surrounding areas. All this building would cause a meltdown on all services specified above they have passed capacity now. Traffic Congestion in the area would be even more intolerable should anymore houses or retail units be built in these areas. Healthcare Schools and Policing facilities are already over stretched and at collapsing point.

Name: Jacqueline Ainsley-stringer

Representor No: PRS04841

Representation ID: REP01797 Question Ref: G1

I object to the proposals for the developments including greenbelt adjoining Wakefield Road/Barrowby Lane (ref 3112/3111/1100/1044/3113) and just beyond the railway bridge on Barwick Road (ref 3114/1165/2156) for any housing or travellers; site because this land regularly floods from the water which flows from the existing housing developments in the surrounding area when we have heavy rain. If housing was situated in this area the flood water would have nowhere to soak away to and would exacerbate existing flooding in the area for example at the Old George roundabout. In addition, the area is only serviced by a single track country type road which would not be able to cope with the additional influx of people which the housing/travellers; site would bring with it - this would result in severe congestion to the area. This area also has a large variety of wildlife included protected species such as the Great Crested Newt and bats so building houses or a travellers; site in this area would interfere with the natural ecology of the area and endanger protected species. I have noted from your website that Garforth has a deficiency in terms of parks and gardens, outdoor sports areas, amenity and children and young people equipped play areas. These lack of amenities are compensated to a large extent because the local community has access to greenspace in which we can go for walks, walk our dogs and kick a football around and play games. If these fields were also taken away from the community there would be very few spaces in which to take exercise and keep healthy. As I have already mentioned, many people from the community use these fields on a regular basis and have done so for many years - any attempt to build on these fields will be met with a public right of way challenge and/or Village Green Act application from the local community. Finally, the local schools and health care facilities in Garforth would not be equipped to deal with a large influx of residents or travellers. There is no requirement for a travellers; site in Garforth - the extension to Cottingley Springs should be adequate and travellers; site would not fit into the cultural area of Garforth.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1118

Greenspace

Windmill Allotments

Name: Jonathan Dunbavin

Representor No: PRS05123

Representation ID: REP05693 Question Ref: H1

1118 - Lime Green - Agreed

The site is identified on the Site Allocations Issues and Options Outer South East Map as site ref: 1118. However, there is no reference in the accompanying Outer South East paper to Site Ref: 1118. It would appear the site has been given a new site reference in the Issues and Options Paper (Site Ref: 824: Manor Farm, Micklefield). The site is identified under the 824 reference as an undeveloped housing allocation with potential to deliver 400 dwellings.

The SHLAA reference for the Manor Farm site is 1118, and this is the reference shown on the map. It is maintained that for consistency and to avoid any confusion, the Manor Farm site reference should be 1118 in the outer South East paper.

There is also a cartographical error in relation to site 1118 (824). Whilst the whole of the site has been outlined, the northern half of the site has not been given any colour coding. This cartographical error needs to be rectified and the whole site identified as a light green site which reflects the current UDP allocation.

We agree these sites should be identified as 'light green' as these two sites are wholly suitable sites to carry forward as allocations for housing development in the Issues and Options DPD and can deliver new dwellings over the plan period. We therefore support the Council's proposal to carry these sites forward into the Site Allocations DPD as housing allocations. These sites should not be subject to any phasing policy.

The sites lie within the settlement limits of Micklefield and would form a natural extension to the existing built up extent of the settlement, with the AIM forming a clear defined boundary in relation to the Manor Farm sites. The sites are in a sustainable location adjacent to the existing settlement of Micklefield and could deliver approximately 564 dwellings.

There are no development constraints which would prevent them coming forward over the plan period. Whilst the Manor Farm site is in four separate ownerships, the parties are working together to bring forward a masterplan for the site.

Site Comments - Outer South

Site reference: 1120

Greenspace

Pit Head Wood

Name: William Mckinnon

Representor No: PRS03291

Representation ID: REP01806 Question Ref: G1

The green areas to the north of 930, 931 and 932 should be protected. Site 1120 should be protected. The area designated P to the north of site 160 should be protected. The green space to the north east of 1963 should be protected. The triangular green space to the west of site 917 should be protected. The area to the east of site 159 marked "The Lodge" should be protected. The area to the south of 1695 should be protected. The area to the north of 167 should be protected. The area to the east of 175 should be protected. The area to the south of 174 should be protected.