

## General Comments

---

**Name: Peter Downey**

**Representor No: PRS04964**

---

Representation ID: REP00313	Question Ref: H1	Housing
-----------------------------	------------------	---------

n

---

Representation ID: REP00313	Question Ref: H1	Housing
-----------------------------	------------------	---------

Many of the sites are un-deliverable and therefore there is a desperate need to add more realistic sites.

---

Representation ID: REP00313	Question Ref: H3	Housing
-----------------------------	------------------	---------

Do not have a site ref but that that we propose is for a single dwelling and therefore does not merit an "allocation" but a green belt amendment to reflect the existing development, on either side which renders this site as "infill" in the "settlement" around Woodlands Drive, Rawdon (Cragg Wood).

---

Representation ID: REP00313	Question Ref: H4	Housing
-----------------------------	------------------	---------

y

---

Representation ID: REP00313	Question Ref: H6	Housing
-----------------------------	------------------	---------

Where is the scope to promote a boundary adjustment. We recognise that this is the Site Allocations DPD but is it not appropriate to consider other adjustments to the green belt at the same time.

---

Representation ID: REP00313	Question Ref: H7	Housing
-----------------------------	------------------	---------

y

---

Representation ID: REP00313	Question Ref: H7	Housing
-----------------------------	------------------	---------

Other green sites should be red. see H1

---

Representation ID: REP00313	Question Ref: H8	Housing
-----------------------------	------------------	---------

see H1

# General Comments

**Name: Peter Downey**

**Representor No: PRS04964**

Representation ID: REP00313      Question Ref: H9

Housing

Land adjacent to Haimlton House, Woodlands Drive, Apperley Bridge, BD10 0PA

With regards Planning Application P/12/04114/FU/W (submitted to LEEDS City Council on the 27th Sept 2012) and a Proposed new dwelling on land adjacent to Hamilton House, Woodlands Drive, Rawdon BD10 0PA - West Yorkshire.

This Appeal is lodged on the basis of "Non-Determination" by Leeds City Council. As we have not received a decision notice we must base our case on the e mail received 4th December 2012 from Martin Sellens (Head of Planning Services).

(Please note that in trying to add further information to the above ref Appeal – the system would not let me add the documents – but in trying to add them I inadvertently set up an

Additional Appeal and ref no: APP/N4720/A/13/2195957) – my apologies.

## THE STATEMENT OF CASE AND REBUTTAL OF THE ASSUMED REASONS FOR REFUSAL.

### INTRODUCTION

1. This is an Appeal against non-determination and you will see from the attached and selected correspondence that we have tried to negotiate, tried to elicit a dialogue and failed and even though we were advised that a refusal would be issued imminently nothing has materialised. Our argument is therefore based on the e mail from Martin Sellens, the head of planning services in Leeds, which sets out his view and presumably that of the Planning/Development Department.

1.1 Perhaps the first thing to point out, as we have attempted to do for some time, is that the plot does NOT lie within the Rawdon Cragg Wood Conservation Area. We accept that it lies adjacent to the CA and that the CA is relevant.

### 2. THE ASSUMED GROUNDS FOR REFUSAL

A. The site is clearly in the Green Belt, SLA and Conservation Area. The new building is by definition inappropriate development (see NPPF para 89 and our own policy N33 in UDP ). This is not limited infilling in a village and not infilling a previously developed site and does result in greater built form and impact on openness. Substantial weight is given to the harm therefore (para 88) and approval should not be given except in very special circumstances (para 87). What is your case for very special circumstances?

B. In addition the new dwelling is very large for the plot, comes close to trees and allows very little room for amenity space outside of tree canopies and erodes the dwellings in large gardens character of the Conservation Area.

C. In summary I can see no good reason to approve this but plenty to turn it down! I would not see any point in dialogue as we have a significant issue with the principle. If you do not want a refusal you should withdraw this application. My view is that if you appeal we should go for costs as the case is clear cut with a policy presumption against.

### THE CASE

3. We would now like to examine each element of the "Grounds for Refusal" in turn.

A - The new building is by definition inappropriate development (see NPPF para 89 and our own policy N33 in UDP).

3.1 Leeds City Council (LCC) refer to one para of the NPPF, we would like to consider the wider statements contained within "Protecting the Green Belt"; we would also like to consider in parallel the ability of LCC to set aside these principles in a previous application – (10/03015/FU – approved 2011) on a nearby site, due to "special circumstances" and despite many local objections. We would remind you that there were NO objections to this subject application (special circumstances - SC1).

3.1.2 Para 79. the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts and the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy which is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. We echo those sentiments, we do not wish to see urban sprawl and land which is "open" should remain so; however this site is not part of the open countryside it is enclosed by development (housing) on either side and by trees which LCC now propose to include within a TPO.

3.1.3 Para 80 refer to the Green Belt serving five purposes:

1. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
2. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
3. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
4. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
5. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

1. It is quite clear this is NOT a large built up area, even though it features many large houses and this proposal will not lead to "unrestricted" sprawl as the site is constrained by existing development on either side.

# General Comments

**Name:** Peter Downey

**Representor No:** PRS04964

2.this proposal will make NOT lead to the merging of neighbouring towns – the edges of which are some distance away.

3.As alluded to above this site does NOT form part of the countryside and therefore this development would not affect the countryside or certainly not extend or encroach into it. As we referred to in the Supporting Statement this area and the adjacent Conservation Area (CA) is characterised by the extensive development of large houses in this rural area – it is not countryside.

4.this proposal does NOT affect the setting of a historic town

5.this proposal will NOT adversely affect urban regeneration but it will enhance this piece of rural land and its surroundings. The applicant has already made significant improvements to a site that frankly was showing signs of neglect and has also helped with making improvements to the condition and visibility of the adjacent public footpath. The approval of this application will secure such improvements and may be considered as contributing to “special circumstances” (SC2) – as per para 81 - local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land (SC3).

3.1.4Para 85 When defining boundaries, local planning authorities should: ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development and not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open.

3.1.5Para 88 when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

3.1.6Para 89 a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this include:

•limited infilling in villages (SC4).

Cragg Wood may not be a village but it is certainly a residential area (larger than many villages – in housing numbers) and the principal of allowing modest development, subject to some criteria should apply. Incidentally LCC have failed to identify any villages, washed over by green belt, to which an “infill policy would apply. The criteria would “usually” include; that the proposed site should front an access road and have existing (housing) development on either side. This site complies with those criteria – further “special circumstance”.

3.2LCC argue: “Substantial weight is given to the harm therefore (para 88) and approval should not be given except in very special circumstances (para 87).” We have shown above (2.1.3) that this proposal will cause NO harm to the Green Belt or its main aim or the 5 purposes of including land within the green belt. We would contend therefore that the degree of weight given to the alleged “harm” caused by the proposal must bear a strong relationship to the degree of need for very special circumstances to outweigh that harm. The greater the harm the greater the need for special circumstances; the lesser the harm the lesser the need for special circumstances.

3.2.1Lets consider some of the “special circumstance” that pertain to this site (SC1 to SC5) and this proposal (some of which have already been mentioned above). We will attach in the appendix a Land Registry Document (WYK719173) of 2002 between the title holders and the Urban District Council of Rawdon (SC5) which sets out the schedule of restrictive covenants and in part (g) concludes by stating: “... the Purchaser shall not erect or permit to be erected on the property intended to be hereby assured any building whatsoever other than one detached private dwelling house or one pair of semi-detached private dwelling houses with the necessary outbuildings thereto of a saleable value of not less than Seven hundred and fifty pounds for each house”. This proposal obviously complies with this covenant. Whilst accepting this is not a “planning” document it is evidence that this area has long been considered by the local Council and others as acceptable for development, which is clearly demonstrated by the plethora of relatively contemporary housing development that surrounds this housing plot.

Photo 1 - A relatively new house on an exposed plot along Woodlands Drive.

3.2.2We are also more than happy to supplement the existing sustainable proposals on site, to retain the trees within a management plan (in combination with the proposed TPO - A76/JL/872662 TPO 7 2013 - Woodlands Drive Rawdon) leading to biodiversity enhancements. A previous local application which was given consent put forward the argument that; “They considered that the proposed development would enhance the openness of Green Belt and would lead to a range of ‘benefits’ including a significant reduction in building footprint on the site, improvements to visual amenity through removal of derelict buildings, implementation of a woodland management plan leading to biodiversity enhancements, improved visibility at the Woodlands Drive junction, footpath improvements, retention and reuse of the former ‘Cragg Wood Chapel’ and provide for public access to the Cragg Wood Burial Ground. They consider that these factors would, on balance, outweigh the policy objections.” We would argue that our proposed development is not as significant as their proposed 6 bed and 4 bed houses, in an elevated position and therefore our need for special circumstance must be less and whilst we could not describe our proposal as enhancing openness it will do it no harm. Our visual amenity will be improved through maintaining a well landscaped site, its boundaries and trees – as opposed to an overgrown and unkempt piece of “derelict” land (not in the pure classification of derelict land – but to the local community that is what it could appear). The continued use and improved public use of the adjacent footpath (on the applicants land) to access the countryside and leisure and recreational pursuits. These enhancements, along with the other special circumstance (SC1 – 5) must outweigh the alleged harm caused by this proposal to the green belt.

B - In addition the new dwelling is very large for the plot, comes close to trees and allows very little room for amenity space outside of tree canopies and erodes the dwellings in large gardens character of the Conservation Area.

3.3We would argue strongly that the footprint and overall floorspace is NOT large for the size of the plot. It has been carefully considered by the architect and the potential future occupants (the applicants) – the plot size and footprint are 650 sq m and 149 sq m respectively (approx 22% site coverage, is not intense) and the 1st floor is much reduced to only 77 sq m to reduce massing and impact and it can be seen from the OS Maps or from aerials that other neighbouring properties are similarly developed and their massing is greater because of they have replicated the ground floor floorspace at 1st floor. The proposal is clearly NOT “very large for the plot”. App 1 is an extract from the Leeds UDP Inspector’s Report on site densities and what may be expected from development sites. These figures show gross densities (which include land for access roads, other infrastructure and greenspace etc) and not plot densities – a site or plot may be reasonably considered to deliver MORE than this average of 40 dwelling per ha. and therefore a plot of some 650 sq m should be capable of delivering 3 houses. (10,000 sq m :- 650 = 15.38 = 2.6 units @ 40 per ha)(or 250 sq m a plot less access roads etc).

# General Comments

Name: Peter Downey

Representor No: PRS04964

Photo 2 - I might suggest that this house is somewhat "squeezed" into its plot as opposed to the distances we have allowed to boundaries.

3.3.1The reference to "...comes close to trees and allows very little room for amenity space outside of tree canopies", is I would suggest a very unusual concern. I would concur that in parts the proposed house does come close to some of the mature and existing trees, which the applicant has nurtured and maintained. It is also recognised that most of these have a quality that merits their protection and the Council have now proposed to list ALL of the trees within a blanket CPO (we have lodged an objection on principal that no justification has been presented to merit the TPO covering all examples – some of which have regenerated and are not indigenous). It is not our intention to disturb or affect ANY tree on site and albeit that parts of the proposed home come close to, they do not reach or affect any tree or its roots. Coming close to something I would suggest is not an issue, coming close to exceeding the speed limit is not exceeding the speed limit. Mr and Mrs Downey (the applicants) wish to move into the proposed house and are very keen to maintain and create a most attractive environment within which to live and enjoy the trees and the space around them and under them. A site visit will underpin the space that will remain around the house and under and around the trees. You will see from the plans that further planting is proposed. This would not be the case if "space" on site were at premium.3.3.2"erodes the dwellings in large gardens character of the Conservation Area" – THE Character – yes define THE character of this area and its Conservation Area (CA) yes there are some very large houses in very large gardens but the more contemporary examples are much more modest and these typify or characterise the majority of the Conservation Area and in particular this section of the community. If this proposal is guilty of eroding the "dwellings in large gardens", then so do all its surrounding properties, which are VERY similar in scale and in plot size. I have also addressed this issue in the Statement of Support to the application, which is attached as App 2. Aerial Photo 1 – The site and its neighbouring housing development.I now include a number of photographs of houses across the road and the street scene - both looking at the development plot and from it along Woodlands – which very much emphasises that this area is NOT typical green belt, it is NOT "Open" countryside, it is urban in character, it is built up. Photo 3 - A view from the site across the road.

Photo 4 - Another view from the site. Photo 5 - A view of the site (beyond the 5 bar gate) and the contemporary new house beyond. Photo 6 - The GREEN BELT of Woodlands Drive Photo 7 - This I believe illustrates the openness of the field and the extent of the "urban form", with the houses running across the picture and featuring our site centrally in the distance, within and between the existing housing. C "In summary I can see no good reason to approve this but plenty to turn it down! I would not see any point in dialogue as we have a significant issue with the principle. If you do not want a refusal you should withdraw this application. My view is that if you appeal we should go for costs as the case is clear cut with a policy presumption against". 3.4It is unfortunate that we have been unable to open up a dialogue with the LPA but as you can see they consider it quite clear cut. The NPPF requires LPA's to engage positively with applicants and I have copied some of the correspondence to demonstrate our difficulties in helping to fulfil this requirement. I would hope that you can see the merit in this application and the case made in the Support Statement and in this Appeal document and the list of exceptional circumstances. 4. CONCLUSION4.1The whole ethos of the new guidance (NPPF) is based around a more positive approach, one that can seize opportunities (no matter how small), one that is not tied down by an over-restrictive approach but recognises that in order to fulfil the significant (huge) housing requirements for Leeds (and elsewhere) one must be pragmatic and where it can be demonstrated that there is NO HARM to the Green Belt and its main principle or its main purposes or the SLA (Special Landscape Area) or the countryside, or the adjacent CA – then the Reasonable and Considered housing development, should go ahead and be granted planning consent.

Representation ID: REP00313 Question Ref: H10

Housing

see above H9

Representation ID: REP00313 Question Ref: H11

Housing

short term

## General Comments

---

**Name: Ian Watson**

**Representor No: PRS04967**

Representation ID: REP01260	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01260	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01260	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01260	Question Ref: H10	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------	---------

Savills acts on behalf of Mr Ian Watson who owns the land indicated on the attached plan at the Rowans in Wetherby. This land comprises two parcels which combined extend to 0.54 hectares. The site is not in the green belt but within the countryside designation of the current UDP saved policies. Nevertheless, although lying within the countryside it is contained by existing built development in this area with housing to the north and also the young offenders institution to the east with Wetherby racecourse to the south. The two sites are accessed via roads from York road or Carr Lane and there are no apparent highway constraints that would restrict development. We estimate that the two sites together would have capacity for in the region of 15 dwellings. The sites are accessible by public transport on York Road where there are frequent bus services into Wetherby to access the Town's facilities, retail and employment opportunities and also close to employment opportunities that may exist at the Young offender's institution. The development of these parcels would round off the built development in this area and be self-contained with no wider landscape impact on the countryside beyond. On this basis the site should be included for assessment in the Council's Site Allocations Plan.

The site lies adjoining other sites that have been assessed as 'amber' sites in the Issues and Options paper (site references 3125 and 1233). The assessment for these sites concludes that these are sites with constraints and that are separated from Wetherby with concerns regarding suitability and sustainability of development in this location. However, whilst our Clients' site could be included within a wider opportunity for comprehensive development in this area, the parcels are small enough to come forward in their own right independently without the wider suitability or sustainability concerns. A site plan is attached to these representations

Representation ID: REP01260	Question Ref: H11	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------	---------

Our Client's land at the Rowans Wetherby has not been considered for development previously and there is no site reference number. However, this site although small could make a useful contribution towards housing numbers in the first phase of the Plan period. The land is immediately available for development in the short term 0-5 year period. The extent of the two parcels are identified on the attached plan.

---

**Name: J & C Kershaw & Smith**

**Representor No: PRS04968**

Representation ID: REP01857	Question Ref: H1	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01857	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01857	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01877	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01877	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01877	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		

# General Comments

**Name: Keyland Developments Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS04970**

Representation ID: REP01862      Question Ref: H1      Housing  
y

Representation ID: REP01862      Question Ref: H4      Housing  
n

Representation ID: REP01862      Question Ref: H7      Housing  
n

Representation ID: REP06813      Question Ref: R3      Retail

[See full rep] Barton Willmore has suggested Skelton Grange for retail development (more specifically a new town centre) in its previous representations to the Core Strategy and Aire Valley AAP. Pursuant to this the Skelton Grange site is included within the table of submitted sites at paragraph 3.2.4. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that the Skelton Grange site is not included as a proposed retail centre site on Map 3 within Volume 1: Plan Overview document. Our client objects to this on the basis that it is not clear as to whether it is the Council's intention to include the site as a proposed retail centre site.

Our client's previous representations provide a fully justified and robust case for a new town centre at Skelton Grange. The concept masterplan within the SDF indicates the new centre would be located in the northern part of the overall site i.e. outside of the Site Allocations boundary but within the AAP boundary. Given that only the southern part of the Skelton Grange site (land to the east of Skelton Lake) is included with the SAIODPD it is not considered necessary to repeat our comments in relation to a new town centre at Skelton Grange here, other than to say that our previous representations to the Core Strategy and Aire Valley AAP still stand

Representation ID: REP06813      Question Ref: General comment      Retail

[See full rep] East Retail Issues and Options

4.1 The East Leeds market area includes a number of distinctive areas which include parts of the main urban area of Leeds, Cross Gates, Austhorpe, Halton and Colton and the major employment area of Cross Green. The Core Strategy states that 17% of the District's housing needs will be provided within East Leeds which equates to 11,400 units.

4.2 There are 6,032 dwellings that are to be constructed from existing allocations or planning permissions (as of 31st March 2013) which leaves a residual figure of 5,368 units that need to be allocated. The Council estimates that 2,328 units are likely to be delivered through housing allocations within the AAP boundary leaving 3,040 units to be allocated within the Site Allocations DPD.

4.3 The total yield from green sites within the sub-area is 1688, whilst the yield from amber sites is 1,455, providing a total capacity from green and amber sites of 3,133 which exceeds the residual requirement of 3,040.

4.4 Without prejudice to our previous representations to the Core Strategy which set out concerns regarding the proposed overall housing targets for Leeds, based on the above figures, our client considers that there are a sufficient number of sites already identified to deliver the Council's proposed housing targets for East Leeds and it is not necessary to identify additional sites nor to allocate 'red sites', if the Core Strategy is adopted on the basis of the Council's housing targets.

Representation ID: REP07294      Question Ref: H11      Housing

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

Representation ID: REP07294      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.

# General Comments

<b>Name: National Grid</b>		
<b>Representor No: PRS04972</b>		
Representation ID: REP01870	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		
Representation ID: REP01870	Question Ref: H4	Housing
y		
Representation ID: REP01870	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		

# General Comments

**Name:** National Grid

**Representor No:** PRS04972

Representation ID: REP05899

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

National Grid has appointed AMEC to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the current consultation on the above document.

## Overview – National Grid

National Grid is a leading international energy infrastructure business. In the UK National Grid's business includes electricity and gas transmission networks and gas distribution networks as described below.

### Electricity Transmission

National Grid, as the holder of a licence to transmit electricity under the Electricity Act 1989, has a statutory duty to develop and maintain an efficient, co-ordinated and economical transmission system of electricity and to facilitate competition in the supply and generation of electricity. National Grid operates the national electricity transmission network across Great Britain and owns and maintains the network in England and Wales, providing electricity supplies from generating stations to local distribution companies. We do not distribute electricity to individual premises ourselves, but our role in the wholesale market is key to ensuring a reliable and quality supply to all. National Grid's high voltage electricity system, which operates at 400,000 and 275,000 volts, is made up of approximately 22,000 pylons with an overhead line route length of 4,500 miles, 420 miles of underground cable and 337 substations. Separate regional companies own and operate the electricity distribution networks that comprise overhead lines and cables at 132,000 volts and below. It is the role of these local distribution companies to distribute electricity to homes and businesses.

To facilitate competition in the supply and generation of electricity, National Grid must offer a connection to any proposed generator, major industry or distribution network operator who wishes to generate electricity or requires a high voltage electricity supply. Often proposals for new electricity projects involve transmission reinforcements remote from the generating site, such as new overhead lines or new development at substations. If there are significant demand increases across a local distribution electricity network area then the local network distribution operator may seek reinforcements at an existing substation or a new grid supply point. In addition National Grid may undertake development works at its existing substations to meet changing patterns of generation and supply.

### Gas Transmission

National Grid owns and operates the high pressure gas transmission system in England, Scotland and Wales that consists of approximately 4,300 miles of pipelines and 26 compressor stations connecting to 8 distribution networks. National Grid has a duty to develop and maintain an efficient co-ordinated and economical transmission system for the conveyance of gas and respond to requests for new gas supplies in certain circumstances.

New gas transmission infrastructure developments (pipelines and associated installations) are periodically required to meet increases in demand and changes in patterns of supply. Developments to our network are as a result of specific connection requests e.g. power stations, and requests for additional capacity on our network from gas shippers. Generally network developments to provide supplies to the local gas distribution network are as a result of overall demand growth in a region rather than site specific developments.

### Gas Distribution

National Grid also owns and operates approximately 82,000 miles of lower-pressure distribution gas mains in the north west of England, the west Midlands, east of England and north London - almost half of Britain's gas distribution network, delivering gas to around 11 million homes, offices and factories. National Grid does not supply gas, but provides the networks through which it flows. Reinforcements and developments of our local distribution network generally are as a result of overall demand growth in a region rather than site specific developments. A competitive market operates for the connection of new developments.

### National Grid and Local Development Plan Documents

The Energy White Paper makes clear that UK energy systems will undergo a significant change over the next 20 years. To meet the goals of the white paper it will be necessary to revise and update much of the UK's energy infrastructure during this period. There will be a requirement for:

- ☐ an expansion of national infrastructure (e.g. overhead power lines, underground cables, extending substations, new gas pipelines and associated installations); and
- ☐ new forms of infrastructure (e.g. smaller scale distributed generation, gas storage sites).

Our gas and electricity infrastructure is sited across the country and many stakeholders and communities have an interest in our activities. We believe our long-term success is based on having a constructive and sustainable relationship with our stakeholders. Our transmission pipelines and overhead lines were originally routed in consultation with local planning authorities and designed to avoid major development areas but since installation much development may have taken place near our routes.

We therefore wish to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of Development Plan Documents (DPDs) which may affect our assets including policies and plans relating to the following issues:

- ☐ any policies relating to overhead transmission lines, underground cables or gas pipeline installations;
- ☐ site specific allocations/land use policies affecting sites crossed by overhead lines, underground cables or gas transmission pipelines;
- ☐ land use policies/development proposed adjacent to existing high voltage electricity substation sites and gas above ground installations;
- ☐ any policies relating to the diverting or undergrounding of overhead transmission lines;
- ☐ other policies relating to infrastructure or utility provision;
- ☐ policies relating to development in the countryside;
- ☐ landscape policies; and
- ☐ waste and mineral plans.

In addition, we also want to be consulted by developers and local authorities on planning applications, which may affect our assets and are happy to provide pre-application advice. Our aim in this is to ensure that the safe and secure transportation of electricity and gas is not compromised.

National Grid infrastructure within Leeds City Council's administrative area

### Electricity Transmission

National Grid's high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines / underground cables within Leeds City Council's administrative area that form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales include the following:

- ☐ VR line – 275kV route from Kirkstall substation in Leeds to Bradford West substation in Bradford, passing through Leeds
- ☐ VR Cable – 275kV route from Kirkstall substation in Leeds to Skelton Grange substation in Leeds (underground cable).
- ☐ XK line – 275kV route from Skelton Grange substation in Leeds to Monk Fryston substation in Selby
- ☐ 4ZZ line – 275kV route from Monk Fryston substation in Selby to Bradford West substation in Bradford
- ☐ PHG line – 400kV route from Knaresborough substation in Harrogate to Thorp Arch in Leeds

The following substations are also located within the administrative area of Leeds City Council:

- ☐ Kirkstall Substation - 275kV
- ☐ Skelton grange Substation - 275kV

National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity transmission assets, including maps and GIS shape files showing their broad locations, via the following internet link:

<http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/GasElectricNW>

### Gas Transmission



# General Comments

**Name: National Grid**

**Representor No: PRS04972**

National Grid has the following gas transmission assets located within the administrative area of Leeds City Council:

Pipeline

Feeder Detail

1989

7 Feeder Pannal / Cawood

National Grid has provided information in relation to gas transmission assets, including maps and GIS shape files showing their broad locations, via the following internet link:

<http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/GasElectricNW>

Electricity and Gas Distribution

Northern Power Grid owns and operates the local electricity distribution network in Leeds City Council's administrative area.

Northern Gas Networks owns and operates the local gas distribution network in Leeds City Council's administrative area.

Contact details for Northern Power Grid and Northern Gas Networks can be found on the Energy Networks website: [www.energynetworks.org](http://www.energynetworks.org)

**Specific Comments**

The following sites identified in the Issues and Options consultation are crossed by National Grid high voltage electricity transmission assets:

☐ Site Ref: 1053A: Northern Part of site, Pollard Lane, Newley. Crossed by VR overhead line (275kV).

☐ Site Ref: 3454/1340. New Wortley. Crosses VR underground cable route (275kV).

☐ Site Ref: 1175a. Land to the east of Brigshaw Lane, Kippax. Crossed by XK overhead line (275kV).

Due to the presence of the above assets in relation to potential housing sites, National Grid would like the following comments to be taken into consideration.

**Overhead Line crossing through a site / close proximity**

National Grid does not own the land over which the overhead lines cross, and it obtains the rights from individual landowners to place our equipment on their land. Potential developers of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain our existing overhead lines in-situ. Because of the scale, bulk and cost of the transmission equipment required to operate at 400kV National Grid only supports proposals for the relocation of existing high voltage overhead lines where such proposals directly facilitate a major development or infrastructure project of national importance which has been identified as such by central government. Therefore we advise developers and planning authorities to take into account the location and nature of existing electricity transmission equipment when planning developments.

National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. This is for two reasons, the amenity of potential occupiers of properties in the vicinity of lines and because National Grid needs quick and easy access to carry out maintenance of its equipment to ensure that it can be returned to service and be available as part of the national transmission system. Such access can be difficult to obtain without inconveniencing and disturbing occupiers and residents, particularly where properties are in close proximity to overhead lines.

The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. To comply with statutory safety clearances the live electricity conductors of National Grid's overhead power lines are designed to be a minimum height above ground. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site.

National Grid seeks to encourage high quality and well planned development in the vicinity of its high voltage overhead lines. Land beneath and adjacent to the overhead line route should be used to make a positive contribution to the development of the site and can for example be used for nature conservation, open space, landscaping areas or used as a parking court. National Grid, in association with David Lock Associates has produced „A Sense of Place“ guidelines, which look at how to create high quality development near overhead lines and offers practical solutions which can assist in avoiding the unnecessary sterilisation of land in the vicinity of high voltage overhead lines.

„A Sense of Place“ is available from National Grid and can be viewed at:

[www.nationalgrid.com/uk/senseofplace](http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/senseofplace)

Further information regarding development near overhead lines and substations is available here:

[http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/devnearohl\\_final/pdf/brochure.htm](http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/devnearohl_final/pdf/brochure.htm)

**Underground cable crossing through / near a site**

Our underground cables are protected by renewable or permanent agreements with landowners or have been laid in the public highway under our licence. These grant us legal rights that enable us to achieve efficient and reliable operation, maintenance, repair and refurbishment of our electricity transmission network. Hence we require that no permanent structures are built over or under cables or within the zone specified in the agreement, materials or soil are not stacked or stored on top of the cable route or its joint bays and that unrestricted and safe access to any of our cable(s) must be maintained at all times

The information supplied is given in good faith and only as a guide to the location of our underground cables. The accuracy of this information cannot be guaranteed. The physical presence of such cables may also be evident from physical protection measures such as ducts or concrete protection tiles. The person(s) responsible for planning, supervising and carrying out work in proximity to our cable(s) shall be liable to us, as cable(s) owner, as well as to any third party who may be affected in any way by any loss or damage resulting from their failure to locate and avoid any damage to such a cable(s).

The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing underground cables is contained within the Health and Safety Executive's ([www.hse.gov.uk](http://www.hse.gov.uk)) Guidance HS(G)47 "Avoiding Danger From Underground Services" and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance.

Our cables are normally buried to a depth of 1.1 metres or more below ground and cable profile drawings showing further details along the route of the particular cable can be obtained from National Grid's Plant Protection Team. Cables installed in cable tunnels, deeper underground, whilst less likely to be affected by surface or shallow works may be affected by activities such as piling. Ground cover above our cables should not be reduced or increased.

If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the works, we request that no trees and shrubs are planted either directly above or within 3 metres of the existing underground cable, as ultimately the roots may grow to cause damage to the cable.

The relocation of existing underground cables is not normally feasible on grounds of cost, operation and maintenance and environmental impact and we believe that successful development can take place in their vicinity.

**Further Advice**

National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us. In addition the following publications are available from the National Grid website or by contacting us at the address overleaf:

☐ National Grid's commitments when undertaking works in the UK - our stakeholder, community and amenity policy;

☐ specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid High Pressure Gas Pipelines and Associated Installations - Requirements for Third Parties; and

☐ A sense of place - design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines.

Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database:

## General Comments

---

**Name: Oldroyd Proud**

**Representor No: PRS04973**

Representation ID: REP01988	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01988	Question Ref: H1	Housing
better sites are identified as amber		

Representation ID: REP01988	Question Ref: H4	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01988	Question Ref: H4	Housing
Better distribution of sites within the sub area.		

Representation ID: REP01988	Question Ref: H7	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01988	Question Ref: H12	Housing
no		

Representation ID: REP01988	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
Please see full submission to be emailed under separate cover.		

Representation ID: REP01988	Question Ref: H4a	Housing
This site is completely inappropriate and totally unsustainable and it can not be made sustainable.		

---

**Name: Marshalls Mono Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS04974**

Representation ID: REP01919	Question Ref: H1	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01919	Question Ref: H1	Housing
see attached representations		

Representation ID: REP01919	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01919	Question Ref: H7	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01919	Question Ref: H11	Housing
See representations attached		

Representation ID: REP01919	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
Please see representations attached		

## General Comments

**Name: S Reynolds**

**Representor No: PRS04975**

Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H1	Housing
Additional land off Whinmoor should be identified as 'Green';.		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H2	Housing
-		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H3	Housing
Yes - land off Whinmoor Lane.(Site location plan to follow).		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H4	Housing
-		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H5	Housing
-		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H6	Housing
-		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H7	Housing
-		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H8	Housing
-		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H9	Housing
-		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H10	Housing
Yes- Land off Whinmoor Lane. (see location plan to follow)		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H11	Housing
Yes- Land off Whinmoor Lane - see location plan		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H12	Housing
-		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H13	Housing
-		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H14	Housing
-		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: H15	Housing
-		
Representation ID: REP01008	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
Location plan and representation to follow		

# General Comments

**Name: R&R Ice Cream**

**Representor No: PRS04976**

Representation ID: REP01283	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01283	Question Ref: H3	Housing
YES, PLEASE SEE COVERING LETTER AND PLAN		

Representation ID: REP01283	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01283	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01283	Question Ref: H10	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------	---------

[Copied from main letter - for further details and plan see attachments]

CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO THE 'ISSUES AND OPTIONS' CONSULTATION FOR THE SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN

'R&R ICE CREAM' SITE, MANSTON LANE, LEEDS, LS15 8SX

FORMAL REQUEST TO LEEDS CITY COUNCIL TO CONSIDER THE SITE FOR A HOUSING ALLOCATION

Please accept this letter as a formal consultation response to the Issues and options consultation stage of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document. Enclosed with this letter is a site location plan.

I WOULD APPRECIATE IT IF LEEDS CITY COUNCIL WOULD ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT BY RETURN OF EMAIL.

Location

The R&R site is located approximately 7.5km east of Leeds City Centre. The A6120 is 1.2km to the west and the M1 (Junction 46 (with the A63)) is 1.8km to the south.

The site is still operational (in part). To the north is a residential area and planning permission been granted for the development of the land immediately to the south and west for housing. The location is very well served by existing public transport routes (Manston Road and Sandeas Way – Bus Routes; Cross Gates Railway Station (1.3km to the west)).

For the avoidance of doubt, the R&R Ice Cream site is not allocated in the UDP and neither is it currently allocated in the 'Issues and Options' Draft housing Map as part of the current consultation on the Site Allocation document. However, it is respectfully requested that Leeds City Council consider favourably this formal request to allocate it for housing.

Site characteristics

The site is approximately 4.5 hectares and consists entirely of brownfield land. The site is currently operational with a small part in the south eastern corner being unused and lying in a state of disrepair. The use of the site is currently industrial (Use Class B2).

The site is enclosed by a tree lined boundary (south), and various fencing types and an earth bund to the northern boundary.

The site slopes gently down from north to south. The site is not located in the flood plain, but is on a minor groundwater aquifer (source:

Environment Agency). There are no known Listed Buildings or Scheduled Ancient Monuments within 250 metres of the site boundary. The site has no known environmental designations within 250. There are several access points into the site from Manston Lane to the south and Sandeas Road to the east. There are numerous bus stops along these roads which abut the southern and eastern boundaries of the site.

There are 6 properties that immediately adjoin the southern boundary of the site (accessed from Manston Lane). Frontage on Manston Lane and Sandeas Road is uniform (in that both stretches of road are straight). The surrounding area is urban in nature, excluding road side verges / trees.

Adjacent planning approvals

When considering the suitability of this site for a residential allocation, it is important to note that planning permission has already been granted for the residential development of the sites numbered 282 and 1297 on Map 24 of the Draft 'Site Allocations Plan - Housing Sites'. The R&R ice cream site is a factory site which is not a compatible adjacent land use to these new planning permissions / land allocations.

It is also important to note that much of the site has been abandoned and is in a state of disrepair with buildings no longer suitable for conversion because of prevailing build standards and environmental considerations. Whilst the remainder of the site remains operational, the buildings which continue to be used will ultimately reach a point where it is no longer viable to maintain them for the use they were original designed to accommodate.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any queries or questions relating to the above and the attached plan. Please acknowledge receipt of this letter by return of email.

Representation ID: REP01283	Question Ref: H11	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------	---------

YES, THE SITE THE SUBJECT OF THE COVERING LETTER AND SITE LOCATION PLAN IS A SITE THAT COULD BE DELIVERED IN THE SHORT-MEDIUM TERM, AND IF NOT, IN THE LONG TERM.

Representation ID: REP01283	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

PLEASE SEE ACCOMPANYING COVERING LETTER AND SITE LOCATION PLAN

## General Comments

---

**Name: E Oldroyd & Sons (Lofthouse) Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS04978**

Representation ID: REP00712      Question Ref: H1  
n

Housing

Representation ID: REP00712      Question Ref: H1

Housing

The identified green sites are not without constraints and issues and in realization would appear to be insufficient to meet housing needs in this district.

Representation ID: REP00712      Question Ref: H2

Housing

n/a

Representation ID: REP00712      Question Ref: H4

Housing

n

Representation ID: REP00712      Question Ref: H7

Housing

n

Representation ID: REP00712      Question Ref: H12

Housing

None

Representation ID: REP00712      Question Ref: H13

Housing

n/a

---

**Name: T Fawcett & Sons Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS04981**

Representation ID: REP01957      Question Ref: H1

Housing

n

Representation ID: REP01957      Question Ref: H4

Housing

n

Representation ID: REP01957      Question Ref: H4

Housing

No allocations identified in this vicinity.

Representation ID: REP01957      Question Ref: H7

Housing

y

Representation ID: REP01957      Question Ref: H7

Housing

All - Large scale allocations out of scale with settlement pattern adjoining.

Representation ID: REP01957      Question Ref: H8

Housing

All - Large scale allocations out of scale with settlement pattern adjoining.

Representation ID: REP01957      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Aberford - off Highfield Road; plan previously been submitted to SHLAA

Representation ID: REP01957      Question Ref: H11

Housing

Short term

Representation ID: REP01957      Question Ref: H12

Housing

No - not suitable for servicing without issues of spoiling residential amenity.

Representation ID: REP01957      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Look at smaller village and locations and smaller commitments to supply demand without overwhelming communities

# General Comments

Name: Bam Monkbridge Ltd.

Representor No: PRS04984

Representation ID: REP02071      Question Ref: E3

Employment

n

# General Comments

**Name: Bardsey Parish Council**

**Representor No: PRS04985**

Representation ID: REP01475	Question Ref: H1	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01475	Question Ref: H1	Housing
We are commenting only on those in Bardsey Parish - where we have one green site.		

Representation ID: REP01475	Question Ref: H2	Housing
None in Bardsey		

Representation ID: REP01475	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01475	Question Ref: H7	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01475	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
The generic needs of the Bardsey residents have been highlighted in our recent housing needs survey and this will be one of the data sources used to shape our neighbourhood plan.		

Representation ID: REP01578	Question Ref: H1	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01578	Question Ref: H1	Housing
Responding for those in Bardsey Parish for which there is one green site allocated by Leeds		

Representation ID: REP01578	Question Ref: H2	Housing
None		

Representation ID: REP01578	Question Ref: H3	Housing
No - for those sites in Bardsey		

Representation ID: REP01578	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01578	Question Ref: H5	Housing
None in the Bardsey Parish		

Representation ID: REP01578	Question Ref: H7	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01578	Question Ref: H8	Housing
None		

Representation ID: REP01578	Question Ref: H9	Housing
No		

Representation ID: REP01578	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
The Bardsey Neighbourhood Planning Committee / PC welcomes the proposed LCC Site Allocation Plans, which with respect to Bardsey, largely reflects the views of villagers gathered through our public meetings and housing needs survey. The answers given to the various questions in this consultation document reflect our support for the current LCC site allocation.		

Representation ID: REP01582	Question Ref: H1	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01582	Question Ref: H2	Housing
None		

## General Comments

---

**Name: Bardsey Parish Council**

**Representor No: PRS04985**

Representation ID: REP01582	Question Ref: H3	Housing
No		

Representation ID: REP01582	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01582	Question Ref: H5	Housing
None		

Representation ID: REP01582	Question Ref: H7	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01582	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

The Bardsey Neighbourhood Planning Committee / PC welcomes the proposed LCC Site Allocation Plans, which with respect to Bardsey, largely reflects the views of villagers gathered through our public meetings and housing needs survey. The answers given to the various questions in this consultation document reflect our support for the current LCC site allocation.

---

**Name: Daniel Newett**

**Representor No: PRS04986**

Representation ID: REP00703	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP00703	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP00703	Question Ref: H6	Housing
No		

Representation ID: REP00703	Question Ref: H7	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP00703	Question Ref: H10	Housing
No		



## General Comments

**Name: Electricity Supply Nominees Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS04987**

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H1	Housing
See attached representation		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H3	Housing
Site 343 - see attached representation		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n/a		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H5	Housing
n/a		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H6	Housing
n/a		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H7	Housing
Site 343 - See attached representation		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H8	Housing
Site 343 - See attached representation		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H9	Housing
n/a		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H10	Housing
Site 343 - See attached representation		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H11	Housing
Site 343 - See attached representation		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H12	Housing
n/a		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H13	Housing
n/a		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H14	Housing
n/a		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: H15	Housing
n/a		

Representation ID: REP01842	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
See attached representation		

Representation ID: REP06071	Question Ref: H7	Housing
-----------------------------	------------------	---------

No. Reason - The basis for identification of red sites is flawed in a number of instances. This includes the assessment made of Site 343.

# General Comments

**Name:** Electricity Supply Nominees Ltd  
**Representor No:** PRS04987

Representation ID: REP06071      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

We suggest that existing UDP allocations should be reassessed as part of the site allocations process. Where a site has not been delivered since the adoption of the UDP (2001) deliverability of allocated sites, and their appropriateness, requires reconsideration. It is unrealistic to assume that UDP allocations should simply be carried forward. Sites previously identified in the UDP should be subject to review, against the tests outlined in the NPPF. It is likely that, following reassessment, a number of UDP allocations will not be carried forward into the plan and this will result in a requirement for the allocation of additional land for development.

Site assessment methodology  
There is a lack of transparency relating to how the Council has assessed and scored sites. No information has been made available during the process of how and why a site has been scored and ranked and the basis upon which the Council has reached its conclusion.

# General Comments

**Name: Electricity Supply Nominees Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS04987**

Representation ID: REP06098      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

## 1 Introduction

1.1 These representations are submitted on behalf of Electricity Supply Nominees Ltd, in response to consultation in respect of the Leeds Site Allocations Development Plan Document – Issues and Options.

1.2 Electricity Supply Nominees Ltd control land to the north of Wakefield Road, Leeds and these representations should be viewed within the context of that land interest. The consultation documentation has designated the lands as a red site, i.e. one “not considered suitable for allocation for housing”.

1.3 As part of the preparation of this submission, we have reviewed the site assessment of the lands in question and have found it to be incorrect in some respects. We make reference to this within this submission..

## 2 Planning Policy Context

2.1 With regard to overarching planning policy, the key consideration in this regard is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that to boost significantly the supply of housing local planning authorities and plans should: “identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements

2.2 The NPPF states that to be considered deliverable, sites should be;

- available now,
- offer a suitable location for development now, and
- be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable.

2.3 At Paragraph 50 the NPPF states that:

“To deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should:

- plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes);
- identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand; and
- where they have identified that affordable housing is needed, set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified (for example to improve or make more effective use of the existing housing stock) and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. Such policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time.”

2.4 This is further supported by paragraph 52 of the NPPF which states:

“The supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities. Working with the support of their communities, local planning authorities should consider whether such opportunities provide the best way of achieving sustainable development. In doing so, they should consider whether it is appropriate to establish Green Belt around or adjoining any such new development”.

2.5 With regard to the preparation of development plans, the NPPF is also clear. It states at paragraph 154 that:

3

“Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan”

2.6 Paragraph 157 of the NPPF is also relevant. It states that:

“Crucially, Local Plans should:

- plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of this Framework;
- be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date...allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary, and provide detail on form, scale, access and quantum of development where appropriate”.

2.7 When examining local plans, an assessment overall “soundness” should be made along with all of the relevant legal tests. Paragraph 182 of the NPPF states at that to be considered sound development plans should be:

Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;

# General Comments

---

**Name: Electricity Supply Nominees Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS04987**

Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and  
Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

## 3 General Comments

3.1 Alongside the detailed site specific comments set out in this report, there are a number of general comments which are relevant to consideration of the whole plan. These comments relate to:

- Plan timeframe;
- Quantum of Development;
- Existing UDP allocations; and
- Site assessment methodology.

### Plan timeframe

3.2 The NPPF is clear regarding the timescales for a planning document and states that plans should:

"be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date;" (Paragraph 157).

3.3 The site allocations DPD has identified 2028 as the end of the plan period. The plan is unlikely to be adopted until around 2015/2016 and there is, therefore, a significant risk that the site allocations DPD will not be in place for a 15 year period.

3.4 The timeframe of the plan is clearly an issue for the Core Strategy process but we are concerned that it will have wider repercussions for the Site Allocations DPD. On this basis, we suggest that the plan is extended to at least 2032 to allow for a 15 year period.

### Quantum of Development

3.5 The Council states in its Site Allocations DPD summary that 66,000 residential units (excluding windfall) are being planned for and that this number has been "agreed". It is noted that far from being agreed the overall housing numbers are being challenged as a result of examination of the Core Strategy and the numbers may be subject to revision.

### Existing UDP allocations

3.6 We suggest that existing UDP allocations should be reassessed as part of the site allocations process. Where a site has not been delivered since the adoption of the UDP (2001) deliverability of allocated sites, and their appropriateness, requires reconsideration.

3.7 It is unrealistic to assume that UDP allocations should simply be carried forward. Sites previously identified in the UDP should be subject to review, against the tests outlined in the NPPF. It is likely that, following reassessment, a number of UDP allocations will not

5

be carried forward into the plan and this will result in a requirement for the allocation of additional land for development.

### Site assessment methodology

3.8 There is a lack of transparency relating to how the Council has assessed and scored sites. No information has been made available during the process of how and why a site has been scored and ranked and the basis upon which the Council has reached its conclusion.

### Summary

3.9 In summary, and based on the information above, we would recommend the following:

- The plan period should be extended to at least 2032
- Further consideration of the overall housing numbers and the lack of agreement
- All UDP allocations to be reviewed as part of the site selection process.
- Detailed site assessment methodology to be provided..

## General Comments

---

**Name: M, D & H Lupton**

**Representor No: PRS04988**

Representation ID: REP01977	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01977	Question Ref: H4	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01977	Question Ref: H4	Housing
Full answer provided in detailed letter dated 29.07.13.		

Representation ID: REP01977	Question Ref: H7	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP07045	Question Ref: H7	Housing
Yes		

Reason

GVA has reviewed the detailed site assessments for the red sites with capacity for 50+ units in the North Leeds Housing Market Area. These sites are therefore of a comparable size to my clients' site (4013), and the associated wider development opportunity of the Elmete Lane sites (1190, 2063, 3315 and 4013).

GVA supports the Council's review of these sites and the conclusion that they should all be red sites, primarily due to the fact they would in the main fail the tests set out in the Green Belt Review Methodology, but also due to the other detailed planning arguments that have informed the decision.

One thing we have noted, however, is that no detailed site assessment has been published for site 84 on Elmete Lane – we would be grateful if this could be shared.

---

**Name: J Smith**

**Representor No: PRS04989**

Representation ID: REP01903	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01903	Question Ref: H4	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01903	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		

## General Comments

---

**Name: J Hyland**

**Representor No: PRS04991**

Representation ID: REP01098	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01098	Question Ref: H1	Housing
There are no housing sites shown for East Keswick.		

Representation ID: REP01098	Question Ref: H3	Housing
Land off 10 Rose Croft, East Keswick. LS17 9HR. Site currently in Green Belt. The village has a lack of housing for the elderly (wishing to downsize) and the young. A provision of a more varied mix of housing is needed in this village. A site off Rose Croft (1.2Ha) would be a suitable site to alleviate this.		

Representation ID: REP01098	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01098	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01098	Question Ref: H10	Housing
Land to rear of 10 Rose Croft, East Keswick. LS17 9HR. The village has a lack of housing for the elderly (wishing to downsize) and the young. A provision of a more varied mix of housing is needed in this village. A site off Rose Croft (1.2Ha) would be a suitable site to alleviate this.		

---

**Name: Trustees Of Henry Hudson**

**Representor No: PRS04992**

Representation ID: REP02005	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP02005	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP02005	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		

---

**Name: Mick Brook**

**Representor No: PRS04994**

Representation ID: REP01212	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01212	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		

# General Comments

**Name:** TCS Holdings Ltd

**Representor No:** PRS04995

Representation ID: REP02060 Question Ref: RVol1

Retail

n

Representation ID: REP02060 Question Ref: CCR3

Retail

Our client supports the proposed PSA boundary insofar as it includes the Merrion Centre, but queries why it does not include The Light, which is also a covered shopping and leisure scheme and functionally comprises part of the City's PSA.

Representation ID: REP02060 Question Ref: CCR4

Retail

We note that at the Merrion Centre that the primary and secondary frontages are proposed to be amended in part to remove the frontage policy from the internal Georgian Mall (to the rear of Morrisons) and to remove it entirely externally on the Wade Lane frontage. This is supported. We also note that externally on the eastern end of the Merrion Street frontage the Primary area is amended to Secondary frontage which would, allow a wider range of uses in this area (50% retained as A1) yet this ignores the fact that the remaining part of Merrion Street is no longer in A1 use.

However, whilst the proposed amendments provide some 'tinkering at the edges' and this may provide some flexibility over the uses in two or three locations, internally the centre remains identified as primary frontage and this means that 80% of the frontages must remain in A1 use. This clearly does not provide the positive and flexible policy framework that will be necessary to allow our client to shape its retail and leisure offer in response to the constantly changing retail dynamics in the City. Designating internal streets within the Merrion Centre is also wholly inconsistent with the approach to Trinity Leeds where only external streets are identified as Primary Frontage. This is entirely unreasonable and the City Council must adopt a consistent and fair policy approach across the PSA if it is to avoid engendering competitive advantages to one scheme over others and putting at risk the overall vitality and viability of the City Centre. Furthermore within The Light, the vast majority of the units internally are no longer in A1 use. The entire centre appears to have been excluded from any detailed consideration and simply excluded from the PSA. This scheme has been allowed to respond to the demands of the market and has changed its retail and leisure offer in recent years in order to maintain competitive. It has done so apparently successfully and without detriment to the vitality and viability of the City Centre. For consistency, the Merrion Centre should be afforded the same increased flexibility. The inconsistent application of Primary and Secondary Frontage designations across different schemes within the PSA is also at odds with Government guidance in the NPPF, which is that policies should be positive and promote "competitive town centre environments". The continued use of the frontage policy should be reconsidered and removed entirely for the Merrion Centre.

Representation ID: REP02060 Question Ref: CCR5

Retail

Whilst we note paragraph 2.2,10 of the SADPD states that centre operators should have more flexibility to control the shopping offer themselves, this has actually not translated into the draft policy approach. The proposed implementation of a 20% limit on non-A1 uses, will unduly restrict the ability of schemes such as the Merrion Centre to respond to changing retail and leisure demands in the City Centre. Older schemes such as the Merrion Centre must be able to adapt if they are to survive. As currently proposed, the Council's policy approach to covered shopping centres is inconsistent across the PSA (again the Light is excluded from any policy at all) and by unduly constraining some schemes more than others, is wholly at odds with national guidance as set out in the NPPF. As currently suggested this policy seeks to control use rather than provide any positive form of promotion and in this respect it is contrary to the NPPF as the Council is failing to pursue policies for the City that support vitality and viability of the centres. It is also not clear at this stage how such a policy for covered centres would work where there is a mix of primary and secondary frontages identified, there is a degree of confusion over which would take precedence. Our client would therefore welcome a bespoke policy for the Merrion Centre as a covered shopping centre if it enables total flexibility over uses to be permitted. In order for our Client to respond to the retail challenges presented by new development in the southern part of the City and to facilitate investment in their Centre, they need to be able to deliver as much flexibility as possible to enhance its tenant appeal and mixed use offer. Thus, not just the full range of 'A' class retail uses, but also leisure (D1 and D2) and B1 business uses, where necessary. We trust the Council will discuss the policy approach with our Client in further detail before progressing to the next stage of the Plan process.

Representation ID: REP02060 Question Ref: CCR6

Retail

No. Our client does not agree that the Council should introduce a policy to resist development of establishments in 'hotspots' of concern. It is not for the planning system or the SADPD to control activities which are the responsibility of the licensing authority. Again this approach would seek to interfere with the market and this is unacceptable.

Representation ID: REP02060 Question Ref: General comment

Retail

Savills is instructed by TCS Holdings Ltd a subsidiary of Town Centre Securities Plc to submit representations on its behalf to the Council's Site Allocations Plan Development Plan Document (SADPD) Issues and Options in respect of the retail policy matters raised in the draft document. The Comments that follow relate specifically to our client's interests at the Merrion Centre. The Merrion Centre occupies a prominent location in the City with over 100 retailers and it is due to celebrate its 50th birthday next year. As a general point it is essential that Council's retail policies support one of the longest established shopping centres in the Region and allow it to evolve, change and respond to the ever changing demands of the retail market and consumer demands. The Centre is currently benefitting from an on-going programme of refurbishment and reconfiguration to enhance the retail offer and shopping experience on Merrion Way with the New Front scheme. In addition, the 'New Merrion House' project which will comprise the refurbishment, re-cladding and extension of the existing Merrion House to form new offices and a 'One Stop Shop' for Leeds City Council. The important position of the Merrion Centre within the City has no doubt been re-inforced with the opening of the First Direct Arena immediately to the north of Merrion Way. Notwithstanding these changes, it is fair to say that as the Centre was constructed during the 1960's it still contains a large proportion of smaller retail units (some 45% are below 1000sqft) which are now no longer attractive to modern retail requirements. It is vitally important that the Merrion Centre is afforded sufficient flexibility in terms of managing their retail and leisure offer to be able to respond to demands of operators as well as to other recent developments in the City. Footfall to the Merrion Centre has suffered following the opening of the Trinity centre and the planned opening of Eastgate presents a risk that the focus of retailing will divert away from the northern part of the City Centre. If there are undue policy constraints, there is a very real danger that the success of Trinity Leeds and Eastgate/Victoriagate will be to the detriment of centres such as the Merrion and the City as a whole. It is essential therefore that the Council puts in place a positive and flexible policy framework to support the Merrion Centre. Our Client would welcome discussion with the Council about how the policies could be worded to facilitate this necessary flexibility. This is this context to our detailed response to the Council's questions in this submission.

## General Comments

---

**Name: J & J Prescott**

**Representor No: PRS04996**

Representation ID: REP02008	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP02008	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP02008	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP02008	Question Ref: H4a	Housing
This site is completely inappropriate and totally unsustainable and it can not be made sustainable.		

---

**Name: J Silversides**

**Representor No: PRS04997**

Representation ID: REP01959	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01959	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01959	Question Ref: H4	Housing
better and smaller village sites exist and are more sustainable		

Representation ID: REP01959	Question Ref: H7	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01959	Question Ref: H7	Housing
All - excessively large allocations dwarfing adjoining neighbourhoods.		

Representation ID: REP01959	Question Ref: H11	Housing
short medium term.		

Representation ID: REP01959	Question Ref: H12	Housing
too close to residential areas and impact on amenity severe.		

Representation ID: REP01959	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
Preference to seek to maximise numbers by lower scale developments in all available village locations so as not to overwhelm.		

---

**Name: H Stevenson**

**Representor No: PRS04998**

Representation ID: REP01899	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01899	Question Ref: H4	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP01899	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		



# General Comments

**Name: W Machell**

**Representor No: PRS04999**

Representation ID: REP01906	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01906	Question Ref: H1	Housing
Greenspace Site 1111P (the subject of representatoin W98351132106) is suitable in part for market and affordable housing, together with recreational and amenity space.		

Representation ID: REP01906	Question Ref: H3	Housing
See above.		

Representation ID: REP01906	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01906	Question Ref: H6	Housing
See above.		

Representation ID: REP01906	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP01906	Question Ref: H10	Housing
Yes, see above.		

Representation ID: REP01906	Question Ref: H11	Housing
Do not agree that any of the residential development sites should be phased unless due to technical or other constraints they cannot be brought forward in the early stages of the Plan.		

Representation ID: REP01906	Question Ref: H15	Housing
Greenspace site 1111P (part) where a pleasant development primarily of single storey dwellings for the elderly could be provided in attractive surroundings with an appropriate component of affordable housing. See also related submissions W98351132106.		

Representation ID: REP01906	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
No.		

Representation ID: REP02082	Question Ref: G2	Greenspace
y		

Representation ID: REP02082	Question Ref: G2	Greenspace
See above.		

Representation ID: REP02082	Question Ref: G3	Greenspace
y		

Representation ID: REP02082	Question Ref: G3	Greenspace
See above.		

Representation ID: REP02082	Question Ref: G4	Greenspace
y		

Representation ID: REP02082	Question Ref: G4	Greenspace
See above.		

Representation ID: REP02082	Question Ref: G5	Greenspace
y		

Representation ID: REP02082	Question Ref: G6	Greenspace
y		

## General Comments

---

**Name: W Machell**

**Representor No: PRS04999**

Representation ID: REP02082      Question Ref: G6

Greenspace

But this will depend on individual areas/circumstances and may not always be possible. Quality of greenspace/recreational open space maybe more important than quantity.

Representation ID: REP02082      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

No.

Representation ID: REP02082      Question Ref: CCG1

Greenspace

n

Representation ID: REP02082      Question Ref: CCG2

Greenspace

n

Representation ID: REP02082      Question Ref: G9

Greenspace

0

Representation ID: REP02082      Question Ref: G10

Greenspace

0

---

**Name: G Lythe**

**Representor No: PRS05000**

Representation ID: REP01872      Question Ref: H1

Housing

y

Representation ID: REP01872      Question Ref: H4

Housing

n

Representation ID: REP01872      Question Ref: H7

Housing

n

---

**Name: Denman House Holdings Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS05001**

Representation ID: REP01962      Question Ref: H1

Housing

y

Representation ID: REP01962      Question Ref: H4

Housing

n

Representation ID: REP01962      Question Ref: H7

Housing

n

---

**Name: Trustees Of A. Vint**

**Representor No: PRS05002**

Representation ID: REP01869      Question Ref: H1

Housing

y

Representation ID: REP01869      Question Ref: H4

Housing

n

Representation ID: REP01869      Question Ref: H7

Housing

n

## General Comments

---

**Name: G Johnson**

**Representor No: PRS05005**

Representation ID: REP00701	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP00701	Question Ref: H1	Housing
-----------------------------	------------------	---------

No sites have been identified within Linton village as this village is capable of accommodating small scale residential development in appropriate locations. This is in preference to some 'green' sites identified elsewhere.

Representation ID: REP00701	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP00701	Question Ref: H5	Housing
-		

Representation ID: REP00701	Question Ref: H6	Housing
-		

Representation ID: REP00701	Question Ref: H7	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP00701	Question Ref: H8	Housing
As H7		

Representation ID: REP00701	Question Ref: H9	Housing
-		

Representation ID: REP00701	Question Ref: H12	Housing
-		

Representation ID: REP00701	Question Ref: H13	Housing
-		

Representation ID: REP00701	Question Ref: H14	Housing
-		

Representation ID: REP00701	Question Ref: H15	Housing
-		

Representation ID: REP00701	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-		

# General Comments

Name: P J Haw Et Al

Representor No: PRS05006

Representation ID: REP00725	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP00725	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		

Representation ID: REP00725	Question Ref: H4	Housing
No sites allocated		

Representation ID: REP00725	Question Ref: H5	Housing
Should be more village locations identified where there is proven demand.		

Representation ID: REP00725	Question Ref: H7	Housing
y		

Representation ID: REP00725	Question Ref: H9	Housing
1226 totally unsustainable.		

Representation ID: REP00725	Question Ref: H12	Housing
None		

## General Comments

**Name: Residents Of Long Causeway, Adel, Leeds**

**Representor No: PRS05008**

Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H1	Housing
N/A		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H2	Housing
N/A		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H3	Housing
N/A		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H4	Housing
N/A		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H5	Housing
N/A		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H6	Housing
N/A		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H7	Housing
y		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H8	Housing
N/A		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H9	Housing
N/A		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H10	Housing
N/A		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H11	Housing
N/A		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H12	Housing
N/A		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H13	Housing
N/A		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H14	Housing
N/A		
Representation ID: REP01148	Question Ref: H15	Housing
N/A		

# General Comments

<b>Name: M Heron</b>		
<b>Representor No: PRS05012</b>		
Representation ID: REP01905	Question Ref: H1	Housing
n		
Representation ID: REP01905	Question Ref: H4	Housing
n		
Representation ID: REP01905	Question Ref: H7	Housing
n		

# General Comments

---

**Name: Communisis Plc**

**Representor No: PRS05015**

Representation ID: REP07009      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Communisis owns and operates an industrial property (hereafter referred to as the Site") located within the Cross Gates Industrial Estate in eastern Leeds. The Site is located on the eastern edge of the industrial estate, to the north of Manston Lane and comprises a number of warehouse and production buildings, offices and areas of car parking. It extends to approximately 4.1 ha (10.1 acres) in area. Communisis provides print and direct mailing services from the Site.

It should be emphasised that Communisis currently has no plans to relocate from its site on Manston Lane. However, the area surrounding the site is undergoing significant change, with many of the former industrial sites / uses in the area being replaced with residential development, including potentially the facilities located directly to the east and south of the Communisis Site.

The introduction of residential uses in proximity to the Site may place restrictions on Communisis' operations in an attempt to avoid any potential impacts on the amenity of the residential uses being introduced into the area. The Site may therefore become unsuitable for Communisis' operations and the company may need to relocate from the Site in order to ensure a continuation of its operations. In this instance, Communisis will need to be able to dispose of the Site in order to raise capital to reinvest and facilitate its relocation to a more suitable location. Given the development of residential uses adjacent, and the existing residential development to the north, it is likely that the Site would no longer be suitable or attractive for replacement employment uses. Communisis therefore requires flexibility in the LDF / Local Plan to allow for the development of alternative uses on the Site. This would improve the likelihood of the disposal of the site and facilitate relocation and preservation of jobs in the area.

It is considered that the Site would be suitable for residential development the following highlight its suitability for residential development:

- As a result of the proposed introduction of significant volumes of residential development in the area, it is likely that the continued employment use of the site would be unsuitable. Employment uses on the site could have negative impacts on the adjacent residential development through noise, vibrations, dust, odours and other emissions. Equally, the introduction of residential development on adjacent sites may require mitigation measures to be incorporated into the employment use of the site to minimise potential impacts on residential amenity. This could include restrictions on operating hours or additional plant / machinery. These restrictions / requirements are likely to make the site unattractive for employment operators;
- Redevelopment of the Site would represent the efficient and effective use of previously developed land within the existing built-up area of Leeds. Redevelopment of the Site for residential uses would therefore meet the requirements of national and local planning policy, including the hierarchy for the location of new development outlined in Core Strategy Spatial Policy 1;
- The Site is located in proximity to a range of community services and facilities, including retail and leisure opportunities, health facilities, education facilities, employment opportunities, open space and public transport links; and
- There are no constraints to residential development on the Site. In particular, it has good access to the local highway network, the capacity of which will be increased once the MLLR is delivered, and the site is not subject to any environmental or heritage designations or located in a high flood risk zone. Furthermore, there is sufficient alternative employment supply within a 15 minute travel distance from the Site to not warrant its protection as a retained employment site.

Site Plan attached. Also see representation submitted for full details

# General Comments

**Name: Communisis Plc**

**Representor No: PRS05015**

Representation ID: REP07760      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Site is above 1297 with 282 west and 797 east - see submitted representation for full details

It should be emphasised that Communisis currently has no plans to relocate from its site on Manston Lane. However, the area surrounding the site is undergoing significant change, with many of the former industrial sites / uses in the area being replaced with residential development, including potentially the facilities located directly to the east and south of the Communisis Site. The introduction of residential uses in proximity to the Site may place restrictions on Communisis' operations in an attempt to avoid any potential impacts on the amenity of the residential uses being introduced into the area. The Site may therefore become unsuitable for Communisis' operations and the company may need to relocate from the Site in order to ensure a continuation of its operations. In this instance, Communisis will need to be able to dispose of the Site in order to raise capital to reinvest and facilitate its relocation to a more suitable location. Given the development of residential uses adjacent, and the existing residential development to the north, it is likely that the Site would no longer be suitable or attractive for replacement employment uses. Communisis therefore requires flexibility in the LDF / Local Plan to allow for the development of alternative uses on the Site. This would improve the likelihood of the disposal of the site and facilitate relocation and preservation of jobs in the area.

It is considered that the Site would be suitable for residential development the following highlight its suitability for residential development:

- As a result of the proposed introduction of significant volumes of residential development in the area, it is likely that the continued employment use of the site would be unsuitable. Employment uses on the site could have negative impacts on the adjacent residential development through noise, vibrations, dust, odours and other emissions. Equally, the introduction of residential development on adjacent sites may require mitigation measures to be incorporated into the employment use of the site to minimise potential impacts on residential amenity. This could include restrictions on operating hours or additional plant / machinery. These restrictions / requirements are likely to make the site unattractive for employment operators;
- Redevelopment of the Site would represent the efficient and effective use of previously developed land within the existing built-up area of Leeds. Redevelopment of the Site for residential uses would therefore meet the requirements of national and local planning policy, including the hierarchy for the location of new development outlined in Core Strategy Spatial Policy 1;
- The Site is located in proximity to a range of community services and facilities, including retail and leisure opportunities, health facilities, education facilities, employment opportunities, open space and public transport links; and
- There are no constraints to residential development on the Site. In particular, it has good access to the local highway network, the capacity of which will be increased once the MLLR is delivered, and the site is not subject to any environmental or heritage designations or located in a high flood risk zone. Furthermore, there is sufficient alternative employment supply within a 15 minute travel distance from the Site to not warrant its protection as a retained employment site.

In light of the above, it is requested that the site is allocated for housing in the Site Allocations DPD. It is acknowledged that timescales for the availability of the Site for redevelopment are not yet known, as Communisis currently has no plans to relocate from the site. It is therefore requested that the site is allocated as a medium to long term allocation.

It is understood that the Site Allocations DPD identifies sufficient sites to meet the housing requirement for East Leeds. The Council may not therefore want to allocate additional land for housing. In this instance however, we consider that the Site is more suitable for a residential allocation in planning policy terms than some of the other sites currently proposed for an allocation in East Leeds (see above). Consideration should therefore be given to allocating the Communisis Site over one, or part of these other sites.

We reserve the right to amend or withdraw these representations if necessary.



# General Comments

---

**Name: K Anderson**

**Representor No: PRS05045**

Representation ID: REP07439      Question Ref: H4a

Housing

NO. It is considered that a new settlement would be in conflict with, and prejudice the Core Strategy's vision and objectives and commitment to provide some growth in local communities in the settlement hierarchy throughout the District. (Refer to PDF for background information and maps, etc)

Representation ID: REP07445      Question Ref: H4a

Housing

NO. The development of a new settlement at Spen Common Lane, near Bramham, or any other location in the District would be contrary to the Core Strategy's spatial vision and objectives, and Policy SP7 to retain the existing pattern of settlements and to allow communities across the District to see an appropriate level of growth and community benefits. (See sections 2 and 3 for additional comments). (Refer to PDF for background information and maps, etc)

Representation ID: REP07451      Question Ref: H4a

Housing

NO. The development of a new settlement at Spen Common Lane, near Bramham, or any other location in the District would be contrary to the Core Strategy's spatial vision and objectives, and Policy SP7 to retain the existing pattern of settlements and to allow communities across the District to see an appropriate level of growth and community benefits. (See sections 2 and 3 (see PDF) for additional comments).

---

**Name: Ian B. Wilson**

**Representor No: PRS05047**

Representation ID: REP05613      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Sir I am writing to state my objection to the plans proposed for Outer North West, particularly the areas known as The Sycamores, Old Manor farm and Moor Road. I find these plans to have been developed without due consideration the extra volume of traffic that would flow through an already over loaded Leeds /Otley road, the lack of relevant infrastructure to grades to accommodate such a large influx of new property/people and the unacceptable loss of green belt in a village which finds itself slowly turning into a small town.

---

**Name: Bonnie Smaldon**

**Representor No: PRS05048**

Representation ID: REP05614      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We understand that there is no option but to accept that housing will be built in the Bramhope area. Whilst we recognise this, we object, in that the local infrastructure is inadequate to support this, and therefore, there should be appropriate allocation of shopping, schooling, medical, and religious amenities designated also.

# General Comments

---

**Name: N Wain**

**Representor No: PRS05055**

Representation ID: REP05615      Question Ref: H1

Housing

NO – The subject site, land south of Shadwell Lane, shown in Appendix 1 to this representation, Leeds represents one of the most suitable sites to consider allocating for future housing development.

Representation ID: REP05615      Question Ref: H10

Housing

The representation argues that land south of Shadwell Lane, Leeds, close to the junction of this road with Roundhay Park Lane, shown at Appendix 1, represents one of the 'sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing' in the Site Allocations Plan.

WHY THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE REPRESENTATION SITE LAND SOUTH OF SHADWELL LANE, LEEDS, WOULD NOT HARM THE PURPOSES OF THE GREEN BELT.

- The development of the site would have a low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl
- The site is well related to the existing built up area of this part of Leeds
- The site is contained by extensive mature trees providing strong, defensible boundaries
- Development of the site would result in no merging of settlements
- The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- The development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features.
- The development of the site would constitute an infill development, which is well related to the existing settlement with well defined, physical boundaries.

The site is in a sustainable location as demonstrated in the Sustainable Accessibility Appraisal included in the representation at Appendix 2. That set outs in detail the availability of public transport along Shadwell Lane and the range of local facilities within easy walking distance.

Representation ID: REP05615      Question Ref: H11

Housing

YES. For the reasons given above, land south of Shadwell Lane, Leeds shown in Appendix 1, attached should be developed in the short term, 0 to 5 year phasing period.

# General Comments

**Name: Neil Walshaw**

**Representor No: PRS05062**

Representation ID: REP05628      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Belle Vue Police Station (currently has no colour designation)  
The group are supportive of this site coming forward for housing. However, the group note that any housing provided at this site should be for longer term residents, for example families, key workers, couples or elderly residents, in order to address the population imbalance in the area created by a large number of transient student residents. Given that the group feels there restrictions should be placed on future housing developments at the site, the Group would ask whether this site should have an 'amber' designation.

Representation ID: REP05628      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Victoria Road Swimming Pool Site (currently has no colour designation)  
The Group welcomed that this site was not currently being considered for housing but would like to note that if this site were to be nominated for designation by an interested party that they would be strongly of the view that this site should have a 'red' designation. The merits of developing this site for housing have been highlighted by representations made by local ward members, community groups and local residents in response to two outline planning applications, the most recent of which (Reference 13/00868/OT) is still pending determination at the time of this consultation response. The group feel that the site should be retained as greenspace for the benefit of the local community and would ask that it be recognised that the site falls in an area which is deficient in such greenspace as is recognised by the Council's Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment (previously referred to as the Council's PPG17 Assessment) which was published in July 2011.

Representation ID: REP05628      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Kendal Carr, Hanover Mount (currently has no colour designation)  
1144 St. Michaels College (currently allocated as dark green)  
The group are supportive of this site coming forward for housing. However, the group note that any housing provided at this site should be for longer term residents, for example families, key workers, couples or elderly residents, in order to address the population imbalance in the area created by a large number of transient student residents. Given that the group feels there restrictions should be placed on future housing developments at the site, the Group would ask whether this site should have an 'amber' designation.

Representation ID: REP05628      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Woodhouse Street (currently has no colour designation)  
This Group notes that a planning application was recently refused by the Council at this site (Reference 12/02712/FU) for a student housing development. Whilst the Group is of the view that further student accommodation would be inappropriate in this area, due to a wider housing imbalance, the group would consider that this site would be appropriate for housing for longer term residents, for example families, couples or elderly residents. Therefore the group would advocate an 'amber' designation for this site.

Representation ID: REP05628      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

The Group would like to note the general point that a more balanced and sustainable mix of housing is required in the inner north west area including more housing for families and elderly people. The Group argued the need for a strong policy to address this as part of the LDF Core Strategy and believes this should also be taken into account when allocating sites for housing in the area. Policy H6 of the Draft Core Strategy makes the case for such a policy and so therefore there is no need to repeat this as part of this consultation response.  
The Group notes that in Little Woodhouse there are significant concerns in relation to the high concentration of students (estimated to be approximately 70% of the total population), many of which live in high density developments. There are concerns that this makes community cohesion difficult. There are also concerns that a high proportion of properties in the area have been converted in such a way that now mean that their occupation by families to address the aforementioned population imbalance would be unlikely. The presence of only one school in the Little Woodhouse area (Rosebank Primary School) adds to the difficulty in attracting families back to the area. The Group notes that there are currently nine sites in close proximity to Little Woodhouse which include planning permission for 1697 new residential units. The Group has concern that the vast majority of these units, if built out, would be unlikely to be for family occupation.

# General Comments

<b>Name: Neil Walshaw</b>		
<b>Representor No: PRS05062</b>		
Representation ID: REP05632	Question Ref: G7	Greenspace
Sparrow Park, Headingley (currently has no designation) This is a small triangular site bordered by Cardigan Road, Chapel Lane and Spring Road. The site has been the subject of a community project to use the site as a public greenspace and the Group would advocate that this site is given an appropriate designation in order to protect this use.		
Representation ID: REP05632	Question Ref: G7	Greenspace
The Bear Pit, Cardigan Road (currently has no designation) The Group would like to see this greenspace protected.		
Representation ID: REP05632	Question Ref: G7	Greenspace
The Triangular piece of land to the west of 917 Monument Moor The Group note that this site does not have a numbered designation and queries whether this is an oversight. The Group notes that this site has an N1 greenspace status and should be protected as such.		
Representation ID: REP05632	Question Ref: G7	Greenspace
The Tennis Court between Walmsley Road, Hessle Avenue and Mayville Road (currently has no designation) The Group would like to see this open space protected.		
Representation ID: REP05632	Question Ref: G7	Greenspace
Green space to the east of Hyde Park Road (currently has no designation) The Group would like to see this open space protected.		

# General Comments

**Name:** Neil Walshaw

**Representor No:** PRS05062

**Representation ID:** REP05632      **Question Ref:** G7

Greenspace

The Group would like to note that the Council's Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment (previously referred to as the Council's PPG17 Assessment) highlights that inner north west Leeds includes some of the most deprived communities in the city. It includes areas of dense housing with limited access to good quality green space and local populations with significant health issues. The Group would note that this situation is not unique in Leeds.

The Group would like to bring particular attention to some of the conclusions from the Council's Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment in relation to inner north west Leeds:

□ The provision ratio (0.84 hectares per 1,000 population) and quantity (89.58 hectares) of Parks and Gardens (including city parks) is below the district average. The area has an average quality score of 4.96 and only 6% of Parks and Gardens meet the proposed quality standard, meaning there is a need to action improvements.

□ With 35 sites covering 35.72 hectares, the North West Inner area has the lowest provision ratio in the district with 0.29 hectares per 1,000 population. Application of the amenity standard would indicate the largest existing deficit of 15.05 hectares of amenity space. Amenity together with Park and Gardens demonstrate a joint deficit of 34 hectares.

□ Performance against the city average for the quantity of outdoor sports is slightly below at 1.75 hectares per 1,000 population. It has a substantial deficit in overall outdoor sports provision of 15 hectares. This is despite the large spaces and number of outdoor sports facilities at the both university's campus sites.

The Group would also like to note the Council's new responsibilities in relation to health resulting from the Health and Social Care Act 2012. With this in mind the Group feels that the Council should be looking to provide new opportunities for publicly accessible green and open space in those areas which currently experience a shortfall, particularly in relation to those spaces which are able to provide opportunities for sport and recreation.

The consultation asks whether it is more appropriate to channel resources into existing greenspace rather than new green space. In response to this the Group would note that the inner north west area is diverse in that some areas benefit from a considerable amount of green and open space (predominantly the outer areas) whereas some areas have a limited amount of green and open space) predominantly the inner areas. The group would therefore advocate that in those areas which are deficient in quantity of green and open space, even though in some areas the quality may be high, that resources should be channelled into created new green and open space and vice versa.

In relation to the Little Woodhouse area in particular the Group consider that existing green spaces should be preserved, improved and managed where appropriate. The improvement and use of smaller green spaces should also be encouraged including Hawthorn Park (east of Clarendon Road at the bottom of Chorley Lane) and the triangular space to the east of Clarendon Road and north west of Little Woodhouse Street which is currently used for fly parking. The Group also supports the Little Woodhouse Community Association's aim to improve the currently unused area of land north of the footbridge linking Clarendon Road and Great George Street. The Association's aspirations for this area are discussed in the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Design Statement (page 48) and in the 'Making an Entrance' Design Workshop document published 12th March 2011.

Also in relation to Little Woodhouse the Group note that the area currently accommodates two of the six city park squares in the area; Woodhouse Square and Hanover Square. Alexandra Park and The Rosebank (over 5 acres in Trust ownership) are also significant green spaces which are in need of preservation, as well as the children's play areas in Hyde Park Road and on the south side of the Marlboroughs Estate. With private garden space at a premium in the area it is considered that these spaces should be given priority for the benefit of the local community.

**Representation ID:** REP05634      **Question Ref:** E4

Employment

The Group notes concern in relation to recent discussions for proposals for new retail and similar commercial units in the Burley Road student village area. The Group note concerns that the area suffers from problems relating to desire lines from pedestrians, traffic, a lack of pick-up and drop-off places, noise nuisance and poor provision of waste facilities. The Group also note concern that such development in this area would undermine the vitality and viability of the Burley Lodge Local Centre.

**Representation ID:** REP05637      **Question Ref:** R1

Retail

Cardigan Road – Possible Further Inclusion as a Local Centre

The Group would note that the section of Cardigan Road from Royal Park Road to Cardigan Road could benefit from a designation as a Lower Order Local Centre in the future.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Neil Walshaw**

**Representor No: PRS05062**

Representation ID: REP05637      Question Ref: General comment

Retail

b) General Comments

The Group are of the view that the Town and Local Centre designations are appropriate subject to the changes discussed above.

---

**Name: York Diocesan Board Of Finance (YDBF)**

**Representor No: PRS05064**

Representation ID: REP05626      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Land south of High Street, Boston Spa

The site is approximately 0.78 hectares / 1.93 acres and is situated within a sustainable location within the built up area of Boston Spa. Access is available directly from High Street and Oaks Lane. The site is not within Green Belt.

The site is generally flat in topography with a slight slope and is considered wholly suitable for high quality new housing development to reflect the existing urban grain and enhance the local area. The site boundary is well defined and is largely bounded by established residential development. Trees and shrubs bound the site to the south and east. As there is limited tree coverage on the site (only on along the site boundary), future development is not likely to have any adverse arboricultural impacts.

The land is within the built up area of Boston Spa, in close proximity to a wide range of local services and facilities. These include shops, churches, sports facilities, open space provision and a range of schools. The site is also in close proximity to bus stops with regular bus services with direct access to Leeds and Wetherby. The site is therefore considered to have excellent access to local facilities, the local highway network, and public transport provision.

On this basis, we propose that the site is sufficiently robust to be delivered for residential development during the plan period. Furthermore, our clients land is not within an area of high flood risk; is not within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or national nature conservation designation and is not within a minerals safeguarded site or within the airport safety zone. Based on the above, and as the site falls within the settlement hierarchy of the Core Strategy, Leeds City Council should consider the site as a suitable, available, achievable and deliverable site to accommodate future housing growth in the Outer North East Leeds Area.

Representation ID: REP05626      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Land at Spen Common Lane, Bramham Moor

The site is bounded by the A1 (M) to the west, the A64 to the south with the settlements of Bramham and Clifford located to the north west. The site's current use is agriculture with the surrounding land uses also currently agriculture. The site is let to the neighbouring landowner, who has also submitted adjacent land for housing development (please see below for further detail).

It is noted that land surrounding our client's site has been put forward as a potential development site for a new settlement which could accommodate approximately 5,000 new dwellings and associated community facilities. Whilst say 3,000 new dwellings could be accommodated as part of the new settlement during this plan period (up to 2028) there will be a need to look at additional development of the remaining scheme post plan period.

The site presents a very unique opportunity and, whilst it is understood that brownfield sites are preferred locations for new development, such sites are not always deliverable. If the Council is unable to achieve the necessary level of housing land to meet the identified level of housing need and demand in the area, this development option of a new settlement should be explored in greater detail.

Although we acknowledge that this is an early stage of the Site Allocations process, our client supports, in principle, the consideration of the land as a viable and sustainable long term option, in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 52) which states that "the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities".

In conjunction with the land identified as a potential new settlement, our client's site should be included within the site boundary, as this would help round off the boundary to the proposed development site.

We therefore urge the site boundary for the potential new settlement to be amended to include out clients land.

---

**Name: Kenneth Morritt**

**Representor No: PRS05066**

Representation ID: REP05635      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

H12 No sites to be considered in this area. Garforth.

I strongly disagree with any sites within the area of Garforth being considered for traveller sites. We have previously had travellers use and abuse land in Garforth. When they have eventually moved on they left an unacceptable mess and left a football pitch churned up.

It is regularly reported that whenever travellers settle/stay that the crime rate mysteriously increases. We already have enough problems with theft and burglary and I am convinced that this would only add to problem.

Again this would also have a negative effect on the value of existing housing. I am certain that if land on Wakefield Road or anywhere in Garforth for that matter was given over to travellers that I would never be able to sell my house for anywhere near its current value as the whole area would become an undesirable place to live. Travellers should be just that, and shouldn't be able to have everything we have to work hard for, handed to them on a plate.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Susan Hughes**

**Representor No: PRS05074**

Representation ID: REP06712      Question Ref: R3

Retail

Unsuitable for retail, not on green belt

---

**Name: Nicola McNally**

**Representor No: PRS05075**

Representation ID: REP05642      Question Ref: G1

Greenspace

I would like to express my views regarding the consultation on the above issues and would like to say that I would strongly like you to continue to preserve a particular area on the Greenspace Map (P16) Inner Area as protected Green Space. The area to which I refer is pale green and sits roughly between areas 934, 160 to the south and 935 to the east. Part of it lies adjacent to the new care home on Grove Lane, and part of it (with a 'P') is adjacent to Woodhouse Ridge.

This is a very important part of the local green 'lung' and provides a natural environment which is enjoyed by diverse wildlife (including horses) and is greatly appreciated by local people. It is particularly important as such being quite close to the city centre. Local people, myself included, fought hard to protect and preserve this valuable space approximately 15 years ago, and its importance has increased even more now.

Losing its' protection and potentially becoming built upon would irrevocably change the nature of the entire area at great detriment to the local population and visitors, including the many hundreds if not thousands of students walking past the fields on their way from Meanwood, across Woodhouse Ridge to the University and back again.

Representation ID: REP06323      Question Ref: G1

Greenspace

I would like to express my views regarding the consultation on the above issues and would like to say that I would strongly like you to continue to preserve as designated Green Space 2 separate areas.

These are the areas between Leeds and Bradford (I think it is referred to as the Tong Valley?) It is so important that there are definite green corridors between the two cities and this ancient space has been enjoyed for centuries and is vital to the character of the local area. It provides extremely valuable recreational space for locals and visitors alike.

1089

I would like to express my views regarding the consultation on the above issues and would like to say that I would strongly like you to continue to preserve as designated Green Space 2 separate areas.

The other area is the fields to the north of Peterhouse Drive, Otley (Locally referred to as Irish Fields). House building can effectively be undertaken currently identified brown field sites without irrevocably changing the nature of this immediate area, again enjoyed locally by so many people.

---

**Name: Brendan McNally**

**Representor No: PRS05076**

Representation ID: REP05643      Question Ref: G1

Greenspace

would like to express my views regarding the consultation on the above issues and would like to say that I would strongly like you to continue to preserve a particular area on the Greenspace Map (P16) Inner Area as protected Green Space. The area to which I refer is pale green and sits roughly between areas 934, 160 to the south and 935 to the east. Part of it lies adjacent to the new care home on Grove Lane, and part of it (with a 'P') is adjacent to Woodhouse Ridge.

This is a very important part of the local green 'lung' and provides a natural environment which is enjoyed by diverse wildlife (including horses) and is greatly appreciated by local people. It is particularly important as such being quite close to the city centre. Local people fought hard to protect and preserve this valuable space approximately 15 years ago, and its importance has increased even more now.

Losing its' protection and potentially becoming built upon would irrevocably change the nature of the entire area at great detriment to the local population and visitors, including the many hundreds if not thousands of students walking past the fields on their way from Meanwood, across Woodhouse Ridge to the University and back again.

---

**Name: Paul Hill**

**Representor No: PRS05078**

Representation ID: REP05646      Question Ref: H10

Housing

The old site on long thorpe lane has been derelict for a lot of years and anti- social behaviour goes on, why not build on this land and keep the farm land, it would be a far better site and would IMPROVE THE LOCAL AREA

## General Comments

---

**Name: Joan Hanson**

**Representor No: PRS05080**

Representation ID: REP05647      Question Ref: H12

Housing

Gypsy/Traveller Sites

I do not think a traveller site is suitable for our area or necessary. The site at Cottingly Springs is to be extended that should be enough.

Representation ID: REP05647      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I have lived in Garforth for that 40 years and have seen it grow and extend many times. I think now is the time to say enough is enough.

---

**Name: Elizabeth Scott**

**Representor No: PRS05083**

Representation ID: REP05651      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I found the plans difficult to work out hence I have commented on what pertains to me

---

**Name: Paul & Sandra Leak**

**Representor No: PRS05087**

Representation ID: REP05657      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We would like to lodge a objection against the excess proposed houses , Planning to be built in the Aireborough area.

---

**Name: L G Wood**

**Representor No: PRS05101**

Representation ID: REP05676      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I read the Local Development Plan with consternation. Yes, we probably do need to kickstart our economy by providing jobs in the building industry, but we also need to build with care as these precious greenfield sites contribute to the character of our village of Calverley. If we build over them we no longer keep our village identity and become swallowed up in the conurbation that is Leeds/Bradford.

We also need to consider the effect on our infrastructure. Already it is difficult to place children in our local schools and doctors' surgeries are feeling the strain. The local roads are throttled with traffic. How will we be able to function with all this extra housing?

We already have planning for 750 houses on a brownfield site in Rodley. I feel that we should assimilate this extra population before even considering greenfield sites in Calverley and Farsley.



# General Comments

**Name: Jane Lawrence**

**Representor No: PRS05104**

Representation ID: REP05684      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Mr & Mrs Lawrence  
23 Hollin Park Road  
Calverley  
Pudsey  
West Yorkshire  
LS28 5PU

Leeds City Council  
24th June 2013  
Local Development Framework  
Thoresby House  
2 Rossington Street  
Leeds  
LS2 8HD

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: DEVELOPMENT SITES IN CALVERLEY AND RODLEY. SITE REFERENCE NUMBERS 1117, 1124, 1123A, 1123B, 1124, 1123A AND 1123B.

I am writing to express concerns with regards to the proposed developments stated above.

There are four major issues that will have a tremendous impact on the infrastructure in the village of Calverley which will also affect Rodley. They are as follows:

- 1 Schools
- 2 Traffic
- 3 Flooding
- 4 Amenities.

Firstly the issues with the schools it is a well known fact that some people who reside in the village of Calverley cannot at present get a place in either of the two village schools because they are oversubscribed. This also has a knock on effect to people living in Rodley as they have no local school as it was closed and at present children use the schools in Calverley.

The traffic really needs no further explanation Calverley already easily gets gridlocked without any further traffic being added to the situation.

The flooding issue cannot be ignored. Already the fields that we have cannot cope with the amount of water that flows in and around Calverley. There are springs under the houses around the area of the old reservoir which was turned into flats. This in itself caused water to run down into Upper Carr Lane. We do not need more tarmac or concrete to add to the situation. A resident in Foxholes had to dig a trench to protect his property from water coming off the fields which would be where sites 1123A and 1123B are proposed.

With regard to the amenities. At present when you ring the Doctors Surgery you cannot get an appointment unless you are at deaths door. The park in the summer is packed full when we do have some good weather. The Beavers, Cubs and Scouts are all oversubscribed. At present the play area in the park is useful for up to 8 year olds.

So unless the development plan is proposing to build another School, park, Scout Hut and Doctors surgery along with roads the villages of Calverley and Rodley cannot cope with the proposed extra development.

Yours faithfully

Paul Lawrence  
Jane Lawrence

# General Comments

**Name: Jane Lawrence**

**Representor No: PRS05104**

Representation ID: REP05684      Question Ref: H4

Housing

Mr & Mrs Lawrence  
23 Hollin Park Road  
Calverley  
Pudsey  
West Yorkshire  
LS28 5PU

Leeds City Council  
24th June 2013  
Local Development Framework  
Thoresby House  
2 Rossington Street  
Leeds  
LS2 8HD

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: DEVELOPMENT SITES IN CALVERLEY AND RODLEY. SITE REFERENCE NUMBERS 1117, 1124, 1123A, 1123B, 1124, 1123A AND 1123B.

I am writing to express concerns with regards to the proposed developments stated above.

There are four major issues that will have a tremendous impact on the infrastructure in the village of Calverley which will also affect Rodley. They are as follows:

- 1 Schools
- 2 Traffic
- 3 Flooding
- 4 Amenities.

Firstly the issues with the schools it is a well known fact that some people who reside in the village of Calverley cannot at present get a place in either of the two village schools because they are oversubscribed. This also has a knock on effect to people living in Rodley as they have no local school as it was closed and at present children use the schools in Calverley.

The traffic really needs no further explanation Calverley already easily gets gridlocked without any further traffic being added to the situation.

The flooding issue cannot be ignored. Already the fields that we have cannot cope with the amount of water that flows in and around Calverley. There are springs under the houses around the area of the old reservoir which was turned into flats. This in itself caused water to run down into Upper Carr Lane. We do not need more tarmac or concrete to add to the situation. A resident in Foxholes had to dig a trench to protect his property from water coming off the fields which would be where sites 1123A and 1123B are proposed.

With regard to the amenities. At present when you ring the Doctors Surgery you cannot get an appointment unless you are at deaths door. The park in the summer is packed full when we do have some good weather. The Beavers, Cubs and Scouts are all oversubscribed. At present the play area in the park is useful for up to 8 year olds.

So unless the development plan is proposing to build another School, park, Scout Hut and Doctors surgery along with roads the villages of Calverley and Rodley cannot cope with the proposed extra development.

Yours faithfully

Paul Lawrence  
Jane Lawrence

# General Comments

**Name: Jane Lawrence**

**Representor No: PRS05104**

Representation ID: REP05684      Question Ref: H7

Housing

Mr & Mrs Lawrence  
23 Hollin Park Road  
Calverley  
Pudsey  
West Yorkshire  
LS28 5PU

Leeds City Council  
24th June 2013  
Local Development Framework  
Thoresby House  
2 Rossington Street  
Leeds  
LS2 8HD

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: DEVELOPMENT SITES IN CALVERLEY AND RODLEY. SITE REFERENCE NUMBERS 1117, 1124, 1123A, 1123B, 1124, 1123A AND 1123B.

I am writing to express concerns with regards to the proposed developments stated above.

There are four major issues that will have a tremendous impact on the infrastructure in the village of Calverley which will also affect Rodley. They are as follows:

- 1 Schools
- 2 Traffic
- 3 Flooding
- 4 Amenities.

Firstly the issues with the schools it is a well known fact that some people who reside in the village of Calverley cannot at present get a place in either of the two village schools because they are oversubscribed. This also has a knock on effect to people living in Rodley as they have no local school as it was closed and at present children use the schools in Calverley.

The traffic really needs no further explanation Calverley already easily gets gridlocked without any further traffic being added to the situation.

The flooding issue cannot be ignored. Already the fields that we have cannot cope with the amount of water that flows in and around Calverley. There are springs under the houses around the area of the old reservoir which was turned into flats. This in itself caused water to run down into Upper Carr Lane. We do not need more tarmac or concrete to add to the situation. A resident in Foxholes had to dig a trench to protect his property from water coming off the fields which would be where sites 1123A and 1123B are proposed.

With regard to the amenities. At present when you ring the Doctors Surgery you cannot get an appointment unless you are at deaths door. The park in the summer is packed full when we do have some good weather. The Beavers, Cubs and Scouts are all oversubscribed. At present the play area in the park is useful for up to 8 year olds.

So unless the development plan is proposing to build another School, park, Scout Hut and Doctors surgery along with roads the villages of Calverley and Rodley cannot cope with the proposed extra development.

Yours faithfully

Paul Lawrence  
Jane Lawrence

# General Comments

---

**Name: Jane Lawrence**

**Representor No: PRS05104**

Representation ID: REP05684      Question Ref: H7

Housing

Mr & Mrs Lawrence  
23 Hollin Park Road  
Calverley  
Pudsey  
West Yorkshire  
LS28 5PU

Leeds City Council  
24th June 2013  
Local Development Framework  
Thoresby House  
2 Rossington Street  
Leeds  
LS2 8HD

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: DEVELOPMENT SITES IN CALVERLEY AND RODLEY. SITE REFERENCE NUMBERS 1117, 1124, 1123A, 1123B, 1124, 1123A AND 1123B.

I am writing to express concerns with regards to the proposed developments stated above.

There are four major issues that will have a tremendous impact on the infrastructure in the village of Calverley which will also affect Rodley. They are as follows:

- 1 Schools
- 2 Traffic
- 3 Flooding
- 4 Amenities.

Firstly the issues with the schools it is a well known fact that some people who reside in the village of Calverley cannot at present get a place in either of the two village schools because they are oversubscribed. This also has a knock on effect to people living in Rodley as they have no local school as it was closed and at present children use the schools in Calverley.

The traffic really needs no further explanation Calverley already easily gets gridlocked without any further traffic being added to the situation.

The flooding issue cannot be ignored. Already the fields that we have cannot cope with the amount of water that flows in and around Calverley. There are springs under the houses around the area of the old reservoir which was turned into flats. This in itself caused water to run down into Upper Carr Lane. We do not need more tarmac or concrete to add to the situation. A resident in Foxholes had to dig a trench to protect his property from water coming off the fields which would be where sites 1123A and 1123B are proposed.

With regard to the amenities. At present when you ring the Doctors Surgery you cannot get an appointment unless you are at deaths door. The park in the summer is packed full when we do have some good weather. The Beavers, Cubs and Scouts are all oversubscribed. At present the play area in the park is useful for up to 8 year olds.

So unless the development plan is proposing to build another School, park, Scout Hut and Doctors surgery along with roads the villages of Calverley and Rodley cannot cope with the proposed extra development.

Yours faithfully

Paul Lawrence  
Jane Lawrence

# General Comments

**Name: Jennifer Kirkby**

**Representor No: PRS05105**

Representation ID: REP05683      Question Ref: G1

Greenspace

G1 – Plan A not found so apply answers to Plan 1.5A – Of more than 700 questionnaires received to date only 2% did not state that additions were needed, and none agreed with deletions of any sort.

Representation ID: REP05683      Question Ref: G2

Greenspace

G2 - Additional Sports, Safe Play Areas and Allotment space was asked for no suggestions were received for specific sites.

Representation ID: REP05683      Question Ref: G3

Greenspace

G3 – Definitely not – there is not enough green space, accessible outdoor sports provision or green corridors along the A65 and there is no green space separating Yeadon and Guiseley. Sprawl should be avoided stop destroying our green space.

Representation ID: REP05683      Question Ref: G4

Greenspace

G4 – No suggestions were made on how to improve the standard of existing green space as there was no direct question on this subject – if standards are set they should be met and any improvement is welcome.

Representation ID: REP05683      Question Ref: G5

Greenspace

G5 – 100% of forms received to date said NO green space should be used for development at all, green belts were to protect land from development it should not have been neglected and laid waste for developers to take over.

Representation ID: REP05683      Question Ref: G6

Greenspace

G6 – Yes – a majority asked for accessible green space and considered it must be protected to maintain the character of the area.

Representation ID: REP05683      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

G7 – Because the ANF questionnaire has reached a wide spectrum of the population of Aireborough, some of the comments were unprintable, but as an overview all the green space of any sort (well kept or otherwise) is very fiercely defended. Space for family outdoor enjoyment to include cycle-ways, sport, walking, picnicking, allotments, gardens and quiet places to sit away from the noise of traffic are highly valued and in short supply.

Representation ID: REP05683      Question Ref: General comment

Greenspace

This response to questions about Greenspace Provision in Aireborough is a true representation of data and comments taken from the completed ANF Questionnaires received to date 26/7/2013.

For the purposes of submitting these facts to Leeds City Council clearly, for their consideration, this response follows the format of questions G1 – G9 as found in the Leeds City Council public consultation booklet: -  
Site Allocations Plan Volume 2: 1 Aireborough

Introduction:-

The ANF questionnaire boundary differs from the Leeds City Council Site Allocations boundary shown in their booklet, as it covers the areas of Highroyds, Hawksworth, Guiseley, and Yeadon (Rawdon, Carlton and Horsforth are therefore not included in the following ANF data). Distributed to 12,000 addresses in the ANF area it was designed to be simple and easy to complete enabling people from all walks of life to air their views, this also differs (feedback data) from the Leeds City Council booklets Volume 1: Plan Overview and Volume 2: 1 Aireborough.

The majority opinion is that there is barely enough green space of any sort already. Although there is a recognised need for affordable, social and elderly accommodation the space has already been taken by unaffordable properties that are already a blot on the landscape. Therefore the impact of any development, adding to the area's population, would result in:-

- 1)A failure to attain the recommended standard set in the Core Strategy Policy G3 table 4.
- 2)Cause extensive damage to the green environment and wildlife habitat.
- 3)A reduction per 1000 people of educational outdoor sports provision.

The use of green space for development is not sustainable, if the problems faced by the present population to attain a healthy lifestyle with freedom to take exercise and pursue family activities in the open, is to be addressed.

# General Comments

Name: Jennifer Kirkby

Representor No: PRS05105

Representation ID: REP05687

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We understand that site allocation choices have been made between a combination of the Leeds officers, councillors, with the Leeds SHLAA panel (which consisting of a number of developers and housing professionals ) acting as technical advisor on 'the market'. Very little local resident and business input has been had up to this stage in the process; we understand the point of the site allocations issues and options is to get the evidence from local people on the suitability or not of these sites for housing. We have, therefore, gained and analysed the response from over 700 people, from all over the Aireborough Neighbourhood Planning area of Guiseley, Yeadon, Hawthorn and High Royds. This is their view.

1.Chronic issues with infrastructure must be addressed first, as Aireborough has been overdeveloped for its current capacity.

The site allocations take no heed of the fact that Aireborough has been overdeveloped in the last 10 years in relation to its infrastructure capacity. The numerous new, dense, housing estates on what was once employment land, has led to a change in the way the area works (ie people no longer live and work in the area), with the result that Aireborough now has chronic infrastructure problems – which has seriously affected the standard of living. Infrastructure issues were 'spontaneously' referred to by over 85% of the people who input to the evidence gathering, with the following being mentioned often and frequently.

oThe biggest and most serious crisis is that there is now a lack of school places for primary school children. Not because of a higher birth rate (as is often reported), but because of an influx of families to the newly built family homes. The secondary schools are also reaching overcapacity. This has led to crisis and unsuitable remedies being put forward, resulting in local outrage.

oBy far the biggest issue is that our roads: the A65 and A658, in particular, are now 'gridlocked' (the word used most frequently by people), 'choked', 'congested' and making life difficult. This is not just at rush hour, but at weekend, when the commuters return home and need to go about their daily life, and visitors pour in to the local retail parks (we do not mind visitors, but need the facilities to deal with them). The overload on the road is causing them to fall into disrepair.

oWe have a lack of places at local doctors, dentists, and medical facilities in general leading to long waits for appointments. This particularly affects our retired population, which is proportionately higher than that of Leeds (16% in Aireborough to 12% in Leeds overall). Retired people are less able to travel long distances to seek medical care, so are therefore being disadvantaged.

oNothing has been done to increase or upgrade community facilities, in the light of this increase in population (11% increase in Guiseley between 2001 and 2011.)

Therefore, the people of Aireborough do not agree with any more housing, until at least the current infrastructure problems, brought about by past overdevelopment, have been rectified through investment. They then want to know that any further housing has had the infrastructure it needs thought about and planned, as part of a proper neighbourhood development plan, first not last, and when crisis hit.

"Don't be ridiculous there is not enough infrastructure to support any more house building"

"As a resident along the A65, additional housing will only create more congestion and misery for local residents this must be one of the busiest areas in Leeds"

"What if any infrastructure has been put in place to cope with all these houses? Most of them will have at least one car most of them will have children. All the cars will spill out into the streets during the two rush hours, are there enough school places. What about sewage disposal; can Esholt sewage works cope with this. Have these matters been discussed or are we never to be informed. I will not put my vote to any of this until I know how Leeds City Council are going to deal with issues, until then they have only my vote of no confidence."

2.Current site allocations are unbalanced; there is an overemphasis on housing stock surplus to local requirements. Available land, of which there is not a great deal, is needed for schools, medical facilities, community amenities, future food production and green infrastructure.

Following the development of nearly all our brown field sites, the land that is left is crucially needed for infrastructure, first and foremost. Ings Lane (site 3026) for example was frequently mentioned as a potential site for a new school. This would be of huge benefit to the community, whereas, 535 houses on the same site would create urban sprawl, linking Guiseley and Menston. Available land also needs looking at in conjunction with employment – our employment submission emphasises the need in the NPPF for people to be able to live and work in an area, to make it sustainable. Aireborough is fertile ground for business start-ups, and has an issue with a lack of suitable premises and supportive business zones for businesses. So, again, we would want to consider local employment need alongside that of any further housing on the same site. There is also the point of future requirements for life's necessities, such as food – with a growing world population, food security is a growing issue, if historic farmland is built on, then it cannot be used to produce food. In the past Leeds has suffered from short-sightedness; a classic example being the demolition of Aireborough Grammar school which was replaced by houses; now, these and other houses mean we are in desperate need of the school that was knocked down!! We would like to think about future needs, like education, food production, and trade, and take them into account in the balance of land use.

Finally, local housing needs are in categories that have not been a priority for developers in the past – we need retirement bungalows, single person property, first time buyer homes and social homes for local people. We do not see the benefit to the area of developers fulfilling the demands of non-residents for family homes, in what was once a green location. Suggestions for the design of the houses that are needed, fit with local characteristics, and include terraces - which use land in different quantities to current housing figures, but which are not popular with developers. Any housing built, needs to meet local requirements.

In essence, Aireborough now has limited available land left for all its requirements (including green infrastructure, see below). The priority must be for uses that make life in the area sustainable, not unnecessary types of housing, or uncharacteristic design, that add to issues. It may well be that Aireborough cannot accommodate the 2,300 houses that Leeds wants to build in the area. We have said in our comments to the core strategy that we do not think targets are based on evidence of local need. Local people consider that Leeds should look for housing needs (not demand) targets, to the many empty properties in the Leeds district and on brown field sites near the City. This includes the huge swath of land in Leeds City Centre South, where Leeds Sustainable Development Group would like to build a large number of much needed family housing. Or, indeed to Holbeck, where flats and back-to-backs have been knocked down and not replaced, whilst families have been moved elsewhere.

"Aireborough is already overdeveloped and land especially brown field sites on the edge of Leeds City Centre ie in Holbeck/Hunslet, should be built on first."

"The Aireborough region, specifically Guiseley, is already overdeveloped and the road infrastructure to support the community is insufficient. Schools are also over capacity. Plenty of land along A65 old mills/dairy works near city which is unused."

"Building in Aireborough should be very, very limited to small plots only. Aireborough cannot take any more housing there is insufficient infrastructure. Poor train services, vastly overcrowded roads in terrible condition and permanently full of traffic. Schools overcrowded. Council stop destroying our area and green space."

3. Site allocations, as they stand at the moment, will destroy a local amenity for wellbeing, and the social, cultural and landscape character of this area.

The final point about site allocations is that the majority of them are on greenbelt sites. This seems to be totally against the much repeated strategy of 'brown field land first' – one that has been repeated to us by Government ministers, who have specifically been to look at Aireborough.

# General Comments

**Name:** Jennifer Kirkby

**Representor No:** PRS05105

In a 'semi-rural' location like Aireborough, the greenbelt is our 'park'. Suggesting building on many of these sites, is like suggesting to Londoners that you build on Hyde or Regents Park. Areas like Wills Gill (1256), Coach Road (1311), Banksfield/Shaw Lane (1255) are where people go to walk, play, relax, take the dog. The fingers of greenbelt, reaching down into Aireborough, mean that many people are within easy walking distance of recreation, something that is necessary for wellbeing according to the Government's own health criteria. With the density of the new housing estates, and the lack of garden in traditional terrace housing, this green space for exercise and leisure is needed more than ever. Where are children supposed to play for example? When houses have gardens the size of pocket handkerchiefs, and they are not within easy walking distance of green space. By filling the surrounding greenbelt with houses more people are being disadvantaged in health outcomes. There is also the case that Aireborough's green spaces, reaching into the built environment, are part of the landscape characteristic of the area. Therefore, just filling in the gaps, as many of the site allocations seem to have done, is actually destroying Aireborough's character. In addition, by doing this, important historic areas, like Nether Yeadon (sites 2126,1104,3033), or environmental areas like the Ings (site 3026) in Guiseley (a name that means marsh land, and is important for both local drainage and wildlife) are lost, to the detriment of the area, the county and the country as a whole.

"Reutilise land that is already built on, but keep open space for people in the area to enjoy and promote wildlife etc. Let's keep some green space and countryside for people and families to enjoy; our children need open space to play in and people to exercise their dogs. Traffic is very bad in the area and will become worse."

"There needs to be a balance. We should not rush to destroy our greenbelt areas to meet housing targets. When it's gone it's gone. Creating a dense large urban area should be avoided ie effectively filling in the spaces between Leeds and Bradford."

"Too many cars and houses in what was once a village and is now part of Leeds urban sprawl. I could not believe my eyes when I saw the proposed draft for new housing in this overburdened area. Why has Leeds chosen to ruin what was once a lovely area to live in? We have a plethora of traffic lights from Rawdon to White Cross which do not aid the flow of traffic but which cause bunching and endless queues. Pavements have been substantially widened to reduce traffic flow and endless housing with little thought to schooling shops or extra parking. Why does Leeds have to make Guiseley a sprawling, congested attachment to a city it didn't use to belong to?"

Few of these issues have been taken into account in the SHLAA panel's market view, or the officer assessment's of suitability. We, therefore now attach the assessment by local residents of the various sites.

Representation ID: REP05758      Question Ref: E1

Employment

In general, the green sites are agreed.

Representation ID: REP05758      Question Ref: E4

Employment

There are further sites that are suitable for employment of various kinds, but more research and discussion through the neighbourhood planning process is needed to identify such sites in line with the vision and objectives for the neighbourhood plan.

Representation ID: REP05758      Question Ref: E5

Employment

It is generally thought that the airport could act as a catalyst for employment in its environs. They will be working with the ANF to identify just what, where, and how, and with what resource.

# General Comments

**Name:** Jennifer Kirkby

**Representor No:** PRS05105

Representation ID: REP05758      Question Ref: General comment

Employment

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has 3 pillars of sustainability, and clearly states (policy 19) that the planning system should give significant support to economic growth.

- 1 Economic - Strong, responsive, competitive economy - with land to support growth and innovation
2. Social - Strong, healthy, vibrant communities – with housing of the right type in a high quality build environment
3. Environment - Protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment, improving biodiversity.

In compliance with a NPPF core principle and policy 160, the ANF has started to objectively identify the needs of local people for employment, business and job creation – in conjunction with needs for housing and infrastructure. Following ANF research with over 700 local people and businesses from across the area, we find the site allocations issues and options report does not support the ambitions, opportunities and issues in Aireborough regarding economic growth and innovation. Specifically the report :

A.Does not support the NPPF requirement to; make it easier for jobs to be created in towns and villages (policy 9) including removing infrastructure barriers to investment (policy 20, 21)

The vast majority of participants in the evidence gathering want to see more employment in the area: the reasons for this range from the positive opportunity of giving a skilled workforce the opportunity for business start-ups, to a key means of overcoming chronic infrastructure issues such as transport congestion. Aireborough has a higher proportion of professional and technically skilled people, than Leeds as a whole; and, despite, the much higher levels of retired people (16% in Aireborough 12% in Leeds), 10% of the population are self-employed, compared to only 7.5% in Leeds. This is fertile ground for business start-ups and job creation, and the ANF would like to see site allocations reflecting this opportunity for new business – currently they do not.

“Should be more sites generally, encouraging new businesses in particular. But, how will roads/transport/infrastructure support this growth ?”

“More sites for small industrial unit to start small firms”

B.Does not support the NPPF requirements to identify sites for local and inward investment, plan positively for the expansion of clusters of knowledge driven, hi-tec industry, or facilitate flexible working practices with mixed use sites (policy20, 21).

We are aware from a number of sources, that there is a significant shortage of suitable sites/buildings for expanding businesses in Aireborough – further research is needed to understand just what is required, and why it is not currently available, given that there are unused employment sites in the area. It could be that there is land-banking happening, in the hope of sites being given a more profitable residential status. Or, an expectation that airport expansion will soak up demand. In which case the planning system needs to go hand in glove with an inward investment policy, which has not apparently happened. The facts that no ‘call for sites’ are coming forward, when so many businesses are growing and seeking bigger/new premises is an issue that needs understanding.

“Before looking at any new sites consideration must be given to the empty and derelict sites which have previously been used for workplaces and the ways in which the many empty retail outlets can be filled, by giving financial incentives to small businesses.”

The result of this dearth of suitable sites and investment in them is that businesses are a) constrained from growing, b) considering leaving the area, and c) presumably, not starting-up. Participants in the evidence gathering have specifically identified the need for units for:- workshops, light industry, professional service, technology and environmental companies. Many of these growth business areas are identified in Leeds Partners investment strategy for the City.

The need for hubs and enterprise zones has also been picked out by participants at various stages of evidence gathering - with the Guiseley Station area a potential zone for creative and design businesses, Rawdon Park, Green Lane being a potential zone for technical and light industry, Westfield Mills for small manufacturing and workshops, and the Airport environs (including the Avro site) being a potential science park, and light industry area. There are no hubs or zones indicated on site allocations, despite the fact that it is known (Centre For Cities, Small business outlook 2013) that similar and supportive businesses do much better, and are more innovative, when they are located together.

“There needs to be more areas for people to be able to develop businesses eg a hub, and not just low paid shop-worker/factory type jobs”

“There should be more and with careful zone planning space is still available . Kirk Lane Yeadon, Milners Road Yeadon, Green Lane Rawdon. LBA area, Ghyll Royd, Guiseley, and Station Road Guiseley.”

“Certainly not enough employment sites near the Leeds Bradford Airport”

In general there is a feeling that both new and existing business areas need to be thought about more innovatively, and a strategy put in place for inward investment, supported by the planning system. The Low Mills area 2802310, for example, is a business area, but has been coloured red, due to contamination issues and lack of development interest; yet has been put on the amber housing map. Whilst there is agreement that it is an amber housing site, the preference is to retain for employment, and to establish how investment can be attracted.

“There should be more [sites], and there should be plans to enhance current employment sites. People need to live and work in an area - or have that choice.”

There is also a view that mixed use sites, particularly when old employment sites are being used, are desirable. Sites indicated for this include Springhead Mill in Guiseley, and High Royds,. On the latter, we would not want to see site 2802330 removed from employment site allocation, although office space might not be the best use for it: a micro-business hub might be more desirable for the location, which was originally supposed to be a village, not a commuter estate!! People would also want to see housing site 1308 Naylor Jennings retained for some-employment activity such as workshops.

“More employment sites are required for Aireborough, eg ex Naylor Jennings site could house small workshops or be developed as a working museum which would be for benefit as an educational facility for Yorkshire and beyond .”



# General Comments

**Name: Jennifer Kirkby**

**Representor No: PRS05105**

All of these ideas were felt to need supportive infrastructure.

"Needs to be more jobs, light industry, ICT, offices, but this would only be possible if road structure and public transport are improved"

"Employment sites without improved traffic infrastructure will only exacerbate current problems in Aireborough. Develop designated cycle path and transport first, then offer mini enterprise zones for start up businesses at key intersections on this network "

C. Compromises the NPPF requirement for site availability for growing businesses to sustain the vitality of the area (policy 23) by allocating too much available land to just one single use – housing.

There was both regret and annoyance from local people that so much employment land had been turned into housing, and, that just as the area needs more employment to make it vital, that yet more housing is being allocated to what sites are still available. As a strategy, this cannot be comprehended by many, and is seen a foolish short termism producing an unsustainable imbalance in the economy, that had serious repercussions. It is felt that employment contributed to growth in the area, and excessive housing detracted from growth. In general people do not particularly want to see employment sites turn to housing, and then have to take green field sites for employment.

"Utter stupidity! What is the point of filling every possible space with new housing when there is no employment also made available in this area?"

"Now you are talking; there should be more employment sites; common sense prevails !!"

"There should be more employment sites, as there is a major imbalance between housing and employment sites. This is changing the nature of Yeadon, changing it to a dormitory suburb for Leeds."

D. Does not support the NPPF with regard people living and working in the same area (policy 34, 37 and 38) and thus ensuring a healthy community (policy 70). This latter point is a key aspect in the historic character and distinctiveness of Aireborough

It is strongly felt that skilled employment, and industry in particular, was a characteristic of Aireborough and should be encouraged once again with 21st century growth sectors, in order to maintain an historic community area. The importance of the airport as a support to local industry in doing this - a gateway to exports and logistics, not just as an employer - was mentioned a number of times. People talk a great deal about jobs for local people who live and work in an area, making it feel united – not giving it the remoteness of commuter land.

"There should be more [employment] Guiseley has become a dormitory town with people going into Leeds to work and only coming home at evening. Industry should be reawoken."

"There is now far too little employment in Aireborough, many industrial sites have been built on for residential housing so the area has become just a commuter ghetto instead of what it used to be an actual community."

In our response to the Leeds LDF in February 2013 we stated that Aireborough, with its specific skills, character, and opportunities, should be identified as an area for jobs and business growth (see box below). The Aireborough Neighbourhood Plan vision now has this as a cornerstone for planning. Our site allocations research continues to find strong evidence and support from right across the area for this strategy.

LDF Response Submission – February 2013

Employment – The ANF is pleased with the part Aireborough is playing in the successful Leeds economy, as it has a wealth of skilled people and increasing innovative, creative and entrepreneurial businesses. It welcomes the policy to give equal chances to access jobs and training opportunities through the growth of local businesses. However, the DPD strategy, gives little regard to employment and business needs in Aireborough. With the airport, growing international businesses, and an increased population, Aireborough should justifiably be included as an area for job and business growth. This is backed by a quote from Arup 2012 economic study of LBIA ""The airport is a significant local employer as well as channel for inward investment and export led growth across high value goods and services, students and tourism. Currently the airport supports up to 2,800 direct jobs and generates gross value added (GVA) of £102.6 million in direct value. It also acts as the catalyst to a further 320 jobs and £10.8 million of GVA. In total therefore, the airport contribution to the economy is over 3,000 jobs and £113 million of GVA."

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Peter Clay

**Representor No:** PRS05107

Representation ID: REP05688      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Hi Andrew

I am not surprised to see application for planning permission in this area by Thornhill Estate's, as they own most of the land.

However i am aware that planning has been granted for 400 Houses on the old Sandos site, this has created a quandary in the village where are the cars going to enter and exit the estate, nobody will say which suggest there is something to hide??? as the current road is narrow and very difficult to excite at any time of the day onto the ring road. I note all the houses on Clara Drive are now up for sale after the announcement of this build.

Calverley is a nice reasonable quite village, we do not want more houses abutting to the the general Leeds area, drawing undesirables, the schools are at breaking point, there are only 2 small convenience stores,there is no regular public transport to Leeds or Bradford other than 1 an hour, therefore as a vast armada of cares will be on the road every morning, night and the school run increasing the traffic on Woodhall Road /Woodhall Lane (which is not a designated A or B road) which was never built for the purpose for which is now being proposed.

As you are well aware i have campaigned for a years for the reduction of HGV traffic to no avail, but fatalities will increase if more building work is allowed in the village as this will draw ever more HGV traffic associated with the builders.

The sites which have been suggested are GREEN BELT there is little separating Leeds and Bradford and i do not want to be associated with a Bradford address in the future, as we are ever getting nearer to that city.

I have become aware of a suggestion that the roundabout at the junction of Woodhall Lane and Bradford Road is being removed and traffic lights are going to be installed together with a bus lane????

Please pass this on to the appropriate department as my wife seems to have miss placed your letter at the time of writing.

Regards

Peter

Peter M Clay  
167A Woodhall Road  
Calverley  
LS28 5QT

---

**Name:** Jo Hunt

**Representor No:** PRS05110

Representation ID: REP05694      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Mt response to the proposal to build new houses in Bramhope: I have some objection to the building of additional houses the first is the need to give consideration to the infrastructure which I have been told is not part of your brief – If this is the case who addresses this? Clearly Bramhope Primary School could not accommodate the additional children and neither could the GP surgery. I would not want children currently resident in the area not to be able to attend the local school simply because new houses pushed them further out of the catchment area – this would be unfair and clearly this needs addressing in the first instance. Also what sort of housing will it be – my understanding is that the government want to focus on affordable accommodation for young people, smaller first time buyer houses where buyers subscribe to the scheme where they pay a 5% deposit if they commit to a new build – I would support this but not more large houses. There needs to be a far greater range of accommodation meeting a broader need for young people and families wanting to stay in the area who can't afford the usual property prices. Is there a need for this- has someone researched whether there would be enough people buying this accommodation?

Overall however I think it would be better not to locate new build houses in the area because people move here in order to enjoy the countryside and the fact that it is not too built up – if more houses are built that will change the area significantly and Leeds will continue to simply merge into one mass – not very attractive and particularly to people who have bought here for this reason – to escape urban congestion.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Pamela Carter**

**Representor No: PRS05112**

Representation ID: REP05674      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Land at Old Pool Bank, Pool

No - No within Pool-in-Wharfedate. There has already been significant development, further development will have a significant detrimental effect on the designated conservation area. Also the question must be asked - is the proposed development accurate!

Representation ID: REP05674      Question Ref: H11

Housing

Land at Old Pool Bank, Pool

No -1095A, 1095B, 1095C, 1095D, 1369

Any development of any of the sites and the increase in traffic will create a 'rat run' on Old Pool Bank, cause even more congestion on Main Street. Old Pool Bank is too narrow! Pool primary school is full which could mean up to a third of Pool children are likely to have to travel outside of Pool. Absence of local employment meaning more commuting on overcrowded roads.

Representation ID: REP05674      Question Ref: H12

Housing

Land at Old Pool Bank, Pool

No- As continually outlined above, one of the major problems is the undeniable increase in traffic/noise/pollution due to the transient nature of Gypsy/Travellers any sites developed will only increase the problem.

Representation ID: REP05674      Question Ref: H13

Housing

Land at Old Pool Bank, Pool

No - as mentioned in previous answers and also the traffic problem is a serious concern across the village not only in relation to the sites in the proposal on numerous occasions there have been bottlenecks (close to the half moon and the old people's housing) but also traffic damage to walls and pedestrian crossings (traffic light signals)

Representation ID: REP05674      Question Ref: H14

Housing

Land at Old Pool Bank, Pool

No-there is significant elderly accommodation in the village.

Representation ID: REP05674      Question Ref: H15

Housing

Land at Old Pool Bank, Pool

No. Absence of a local doctors surgery, poor access to public transport, especially during evenings and weekends does not add up to further elderly housing accommodation.

---

**Name: D, M, S Johnson And Kenny**

**Representor No: PRS05119**

Representation ID: REP05702      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Having assessed the site allocations document it is considered that there are a number of overarching issues that need to be addressed when the next draft is published. There are as follows:

- The overall housing target for the District is too low;
- The Council should not include existing consents as proposed allocations;
- The developable area of a site is generally less than the gross site area and a 10% discount should be applied to the yield of all sites; and
- Some green and amber sites have potential deliverability issues and have been identified in the wrong category.
- All of the settlements identified in the Core Strategy need to have a level of growth to maintain viability. It is inappropriate to seek to create two new settlements at the Thorp Arch Trading Estate and the land at Spen Common, leaving all other settlements to stagnate.

We have assessed the sites within the Outer North East market area and it is clear that a significant number of sites have potential delivery issues and are not considered to be deliverable sites. The Council are of the opinion that the residual requirement of 3,933 for the market area can be achieved with green and amber sites and that not all of those identified will be required. Our assessment provides a very different conclusion, which is outlined in table 4.1 below: [see representation]. The table indicates that the local planning authority are of the opinion that the residual requirement can be achieved without the requirement for any red sites to come forward. However, following our assessment of the sites it is clear that a significant proportion of the amber sites are not deliverable at all or the levels identified. Therefore in order to meet the housing needs of the District, a number of red sites will need to be brought forward. The capacity of green sites should be reduced to 1,073 as the Council have not calculated the site capacities correctly; a large proportion of the amber sites are not deliverable and the capacity should be reduced to 1,950. This means that there will be a requirement for 910 units from sites currently identified as red. The table below indicates the sites that have the incorrect capacities: [see representation].

# General Comments

---

**Name: Bizspace**

**Representor No: PRS05122**

Representation ID: REP07752      Question Ref: General comment

Retail

My client wishes to support the retail overview, particularly section 7.1 which focuses retail development in existing centres and within new boundaries identified to accommodate additional retail development.

Representation ID: REP07762      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We consider that the housing strategy should look closely at promoting 'green' sites adjacent to other development sites which will afford a wider regeneration effect and should therefore be identified as a priority development site for residential, developable in the short term.

Representation ID: REP07762      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We acknowledge and support the approach taken to sieve out unsuitable sites and, thereafter, to undertake a detailed assessment of the suitability of each site, resulting in a traffic light system to identify the sites with the greatest potential to be allocated for housing.

Representation ID: REP07762      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We consider that the sites identified as 'green' represent the most suitable sites to consider allocating for future housing development. On the basis of the assessment questions against which each site has been assessed, the green sites represent the most sustainable proposals, which will deliver the greatest benefits to new residents and the surrounding community. These sites experience fewer, if any, constraints and therefore offer the most realistic and viable option for development over the plan period and their allocation should be prioritised.

# General Comments

Name: Ryan Kelly

Representor No: PRS05135

Representation ID: REP05714      Question Ref: H4

Housing

1080

I do not want any new houses to be built in Bramhope where I live because:

Traffic road, infrastructure - the A660 road is very busy and I don't like trying to get across it with my mummy because the cars and big lorries drive very fast and are very close to me and mummy when we are stood at the roadside, and if we have to stand in the middle crossing sections I get scared. I think if more people lived in Bramhope there would be even more cars and it would be even harder to get across the road. Accident rates on A660 – the A660 in Bramhope is at the end of my street, High Ridge Way. It is always busy. Sometimes if there is an accident at Golden Acre Park or Dynley Arm pub traffic lights, the traffic stops and queues along this road, meaning that I cannot get to where I need to travel to in my parents car, or sometimes we cannot get back home. There are always lots of sirens from mainly Ambulances and Police cars driving down this road.

Speed limit 40 mph on A660 road too high at present - I do not like walking next to the road on the side where I live, because the cars and lorries are very close to me, being only short in height it feels like they are going to run me over, especially when they are big lorries and the gust of wind they cause as they drive past makes me wobble. I can not ride my bike on the pavement on this side of the road as if I fell off I would probably fall into the road and get squashed by a car, lorry or bus.

High Ridge Way access – it takes mummy and daddy a long time to pull out onto the main road, especially in a morning and teatime. Sometimes Mummy has to drive down towards the rugby club and then drive back up again to take us to school in Bramhope. If there were more cars using our street to get onto the main road they would be queuing up to get out. It would be too many cars trying to get out of one entrance to get onto the road - if it had to happen there must be more entrance/exit routes.

Wildlife – I am so lucky that I live in such a beautiful place. There are so many birds that I can watch in my garden and in the field behind my garden (site ref 1080) - I like to try and work out what they are called and use by Bird Watch book to help me and mummy work out what type they are. I really like the Long tailed Tits that fly through our garden in large groups, singing loudly as they go along into the next garden. I also loved the Greenfinch / Bullfinch, Fieldfare, Thrushes, Mistle Thrush, Song Thrush. I like to listen to the Great-Spotted Woodpecker knocking on the tree trunks, although I can't always see him I can definitely hear him. When I look up into the sky there is always some kind of large bird flying above my garden, mummy has told me that these are called Buzzards and Red Kites and that they use the woods that I can see to live in.

They sometimes swoop down and get little animals to eat that are in the field (1080). I once saw some Deers in the field (1080), which was really exciting. We have had a little 'lizard' animal in our garden on a number of occasions, it likes our water feature, mummy tells me that this is called a Newt. Some of the other animals that I have seen are cute little round Dormice, Red Legged Partridges (which mummy tells me fly to our garden from very far away), Pheasants, Ducks, and a large variety of Owls. I have also seen Stoats which are very cute. We have lots of Hedgehogs in our garden. Mummy found a tiny baby one last week and hid it under the bushes so that it didn't get too hot in the sun, when we went back to check on it later that night it had moved onto to another garden. Mummy tells me that sadly there are not many Hedgehogs left as too many of them don't know how to cross the roads without getting hurt. I love to see the Frogs and Toads in our gardens and street. There was a huge Toad in our street a few weeks ago and mummy had to be careful that she did not run over it in the car. On a night when the sun has gone and it is starting to get dark, I can see lots of Bats flying around our gardens and in the field (site ref 1080). This is another thing that Mummy says are protected, and we must not kill or harm them because there are not many left in the world so we must treat them like 'gold treasure', because they are priceless and once they have gone they will not come back! I hope that nobody wants to hurt all of these lovely animals which I am lucky to see and learn about. I have grown up to respect nature and want to make sure that other children can enjoy this like myself, but if this land was used to put houses on (1080) they would not have anywhere to live, and would not be able to hunt or survive. That would be really bad. If we have to preserve our protected animals NOBODY should be allowed to break those rules for the sake of making themselves lots of money. I think it is very sad when I being told at school that we are lucky to have such wildlife in our lovely village of Bramhope and that we must all have responsibility of looking after them, and then it could all so easily be destroyed.

Woods next to Site Ref 1080 – I have seen lots of beautiful bluebells in these woods, which is fenced off at the moment so I can't enter but I can see them and when they are flowering they look like blue carpet. Mummy says it is against the law to pick bluebells or dig them up. I will never kill a bluebell. The woods also have large birds living in them - like Buzzards and Red Kites. It is has running streams which will probably also contain Newts, frogs, toads etc.

A Village – I am proud to live in a village and enjoy making the yearly 'Bramhope in Bloom' posters to try and win the competition in Leeds. I don't want to see new houses being built, they would not look nice and would spoil how our village looks.

Agricultural land – Site ref 1080 and 3367A. I would like to see lots of food being grown in these, or continue to see the cows/sheep grazing in them.

Conservation – my house is in a conservation area, and we are not allowed to cut down

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Ryan Kelly

**Representor No:** PRS05135

trees and spoil how it looks, so it must stay looking nice like the other houses in the village. Why should new houses be built that could not look nice or would not look like

'old traditional' houses like mine.

Other potential new housing in Pool, Otley, Adel, Boddington Hall (Weetwood) –

increased housing in these areas will also mean there is more traffic on the A660. This road is already too busy.

School – already children who live in Bramhope village are not able to get a place at the local primary school when they want one, unless they have a sibling already attending.

This forthcoming academic year (Sept 13) only allowed children living within a half mile radius to successfully get a place starting at Bramhope Primary, which resulted in at least 12 children who lived in Bramhope not getting a place at Bramhope Primary that they had requested as their first choice. So that means that they will have to travel by car to a neighbouring school, again more traffic on the A660. Or they will have to travel by 'bus' although there are no other primary schools along the A660 where the bus service route is so this option of travel is highly unlikely. There simply is not the infrastructure in the village for more children with the existing primary school, this is already at critical point.

NHS facilities – There is only one GP surgery in Bramhope and it is already difficult to get to see a Doctor or Nurse. If more people lived in Bramhope and needed a Doctor I would have to wait even longer to get better when I don't feel well.

Urban Sprawl – the building of any new housing on site refs 1080 and/or 3367A would also be increasing urban sprawl within Leeds, which again would go against the whole ethos of having 'villages' in Leeds, making it look like a big messy splodge on a map!

Shops – there aren't many in Bramhope village and most of the time we have to drive to nearby places to do proper shopping.

Bus Service – this is not good, I don't like waiting for the buses because they never come on time and sometimes they don't come at all when they should, so we use our cars.

PLEASE PLEASE Leeds City Council do not destroy our green sites, and if you do they will be gone FOREVER and the animals, flowers and 'nature' would not return to these areas.

PLEASE PLEASE use other sites that don't have as much nature living there, or depending on it to survive their existence and future. Use those sites that are

called 'brown field sites'. Building new homes in site ref nos 1080 and / or 3367A would be a a big big mistake and horrible. It would make me very sad.

(Age 7)

---

**Name:** Pam Gee

**Representor No:** PRS05136

Representation ID: REP05715

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I feel that I must object to the planned development of so many new houses being built in this area. Surely there are enough houses for sale around Yeadon and Rawdon without more having to be built. The roads are already extremely busy without more traffic being caused by the new buildings and their inhabitants. The local schools are already up to their potential maximums for classroom sizes. Surely we are allowed to look at some green areas without having to see houses being placed on every field.

# General Comments

**Name: Lis Moore**

**Representor No: PRS05144**

Representation ID: REP05719      Question Ref: G7

Housing

The Parish Council notes the comments about deficiencies of greenspace provision in parts of the parish and seeks to work positively and co-operatively with Leeds City Council to find ways to address these deficiencies.

Representation ID: REP05719      Question Ref: H10

Housing

The Parish Council is not aware of any other sites that might be put forward however sites may emerge through the neighbourhood planning process.

Representation ID: REP05719      Question Ref: H11

Housing

From our survey work we are confident to assert that Rawdon residents would like to see brownfield sites developed before greenfield sites. Residents would also prefer that smaller sites be developed ahead of larger sites in order to achieve more organic growth.

Representation ID: REP05719      Question Ref: H15

Housing

Residents have identified this as a need. Provision of this has potential to free up family housing which has also been identified as a need.

Representation ID: REP05719      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

The Parish Council understands that the Issues and Options consultation is not the draft plan and seeks to obtain views and opinions as part of the Core Strategy delivery process.

The Parish Council wishes to emphasise that its response is without prejudice and does not constitute either support or objection to any future planning applications for sites referred to in future planning applications. The comments are also made without prejudice to the Rawdon Neighbourhood Planning process.

Methodology for developing the Parish Council's response

The Parish Council has carried out a parish wide survey delivering a copy of the survey to every household in the parish (council tax base 2499). Additional copies of the survey document were made available in Rawdon Library and Post Office. The surveys were available from 21st June 2013 to 12th July 2013. The survey was also available on the Parish Council website. A copy of the survey has been attached to this response.

The Parish Council received 490 responses to the survey and these were all entered into a survey analysis tool (Survey Monkey) for ease of analysis. The questions provided opportunity for participants to express detailed comments on the sites referred to as well as seeking broader views on housing requirements and preferences. In relation to specific sites participants were asked to select their preference from a range of responses. The specific sites consulted on are the ones that fall within the parish boundary as established through the community governance review in 2012. It is however acknowledged that there are several sites adjacent to the parish boundary which the Parish Council has not consulted on that are of concern to residents within the Parish. These include the Naylor Jennings site on Green Lane and the fields adjacent to Warm Lane. In order to ensure that the responses gathered were solely from Rawdon residents, data on postcode was gathered and any responses from non-residents were excluded. The Parish Council is willing on request to provide a full copy of this data collected from residents.

Other Overarching Comments

Within the survey work participants were asked to identify their three pre-requisites for any development to occur. Overwhelmingly these were to ensure traffic and transport related infrastructure was addressed, adequate school provision was available and that medical facilities had their capacity increased. The Parish Council has observed a significant body of opinion that is opposed to any development within the parish until such time as the infrastructure issues are addressed. The Parish Council has struggled to understand how some of the assessments have been carried out and conclusions reached. The Parish Council also has concerns about the impact that development of sites outside the parish boundary may have on congestion and use of facilities and resources within the parish. The Parish Council would be grateful for more detail on how conclusions are reached in future. The Parish Council is aware that it will continue to collect valuable data and views from residents through the Neighbourhood Planning process and may discover other improvements and requirements may be necessary to support future development within and adjacent to the Parish.

Representation ID: REP05790      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

The Parish Council notes the comments about deficiencies of greenspace provision in parts of the parish and seeks to work positively and co-operatively with Leeds City Council to find ways to address these deficiencies.

Representation ID: REP06755      Question Ref: H1

Housing

4095 Lane to the west of Knott Lane, Rawdon

This site is adjacent to the Cragg Wood Conservation Area and land in industrial use. The Parish Council understands how this could contribute to the "rounding off" of the settlement unlike Site 3331. Development of this site would however impact on existing congestion issues.

437 participants considered this site in their response and whilst there was some support for use of this site for housing it was outweighed by the objections. The alternative uses for the site suggested by residents were that the site be used for agriculture or light industrial use.

The Parish Council cannot support the designation of this site for housing but does consider that the alternative of light industrial use should not be excluded.

Very Suitable for Housing 15

Suitable for housing 100

Not sure 82

Not suitable for housing 90

This site should be protected from building 147

This site is suitable for another use 3

# General Comments

Name: Lis Moore

Representor No: PRS05144

Representation ID: REP06755 Question Ref: H7

Housing

3034 Rawdon Billing

The Parish Council acknowledges that not all of this greenbelt site falls within the Parish. The Parish Council notes the comments on the greenbelt assessment and concurs with it. The Parish Council also agrees with the assessments made by Highways.

This site received the most comments from participants with an overwhelming majority opposed to development of this valuable greenspace in the Parish. The alternative use suggestions sought to expand the amenity value of the site e.g. adding dog bins, nature walks.

The Parish Council therefore fully supports the red designation of this site.

Very Suitable for Housing 3

Suitable for housing 9

Not sure 6

Not suitable for housing 39

This site should be protected from building 395

This site is suitable for another use 0

Representation ID: REP06755 Question Ref: H10

Housing

H10 Other suitable sites for future housing allocations

The Parish Council is not aware of any other sites that might be put forward however sites may emerge through the neighbourhood planning process.

Representation ID: REP06755 Question Ref: H11

Housing

H 11 Phasing of Housing Allocations

From our survey work we are confident to assert that Rawdon residents would like to see brownfield sites developed before greenfield sites. Residents would also prefer that smaller sites be developed ahead of larger sites in order to achieve more organic growth.

Representation ID: REP06755 Question Ref: H15

Housing

H15 Elderly housing accommodation

Residents have identified this as a need. Provision of this has potential to free up family housing which has also been identified as a need.

Representation ID: REP06755 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

The Parish Council wishes to emphasise that its response is without prejudice and does not constitute either support or objection to any future planning applications for sites referred to in future planning applications. The comments are also made without prejudice to the Rawdon Neighbourhood Planning process.

Methodology for developing the Parish Council's response

The Parish Council has carried out a parish wide survey delivering a copy of the survey to every household in the parish (council tax base 2499). Additional copies of the survey document were made available in Rawdon Library and Post Office. The surveys were available from 21st June 2013 to 12th July 2013. The survey was also available on the Parish Council website. A copy of the survey has been attached to this response.

The Parish Council received 490 responses to the survey and these were all entered into a survey analysis tool (Survey Monkey) for ease of analysis. The questions provided opportunity for participants to express detailed comments on the sites referred to as well as seeking broader views on housing requirements and preferences.

In relation to specific sites participants were asked to select their preference from a range of responses. The specific sites consulted on are the ones that fall within the parish boundary as established through the community governance review in 2012. It is however acknowledged that there are several sites adjacent to the parish boundary which the Parish Council has not consulted on that are of concern to residents within the Parish. These include the Naylor Jennings site on Green Lane and the fields adjacent to Warm Lane.

In order to ensure that the responses gathered were solely from Rawdon residents, data on postcode was gathered and any responses from non-residents were excluded.

The Parish Council is willing on request to provide a full copy of this data collected from residents.

Within the survey work participants were asked to identify their three pre-requisites for any development to occur. Overwhelmingly these were to ensure traffic and transport related infrastructure was addressed, adequate school provision was available and that medical facilities had their capacity increased.

The Parish Council has observed a significant body of opinion that is opposed to any development within the parish until such time as the infrastructure issues are addressed.

The Parish Council has struggled to understand how some of the assessments have been carried out and conclusions reached. The Parish Council also has concerns about the impact that development of sites outside the parish boundary may have on congestion and use of facilities and resources within the parish. The Parish Council would be grateful for more detail on how conclusions are reached in future.

The Parish Council is aware that it will continue to collect valuable data and views from residents through the Neighbourhood Planning process and may discover other improvements and requirements may be necessary to support future development within and adjacent to the Parish.



# General Comments

---

**Name: Lis Moore**

**Representor No: PRS05144**

Representation ID: REP06770      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

G7 Other comments about greenspace

The Parish Council notes the comments about deficiencies of greenspace provision in parts of the parish and seeks to work positively and co-operatively with Leeds City Council to find ways to address these deficiencies.

---

**Name: Hammerson Uk Properties PLC (Hammerson)**

**Representor No: PRS05146**

Representation ID: REP05724      Question Ref: R3

Retail

R3 – Comments on Sites for Retail Development

Hammerson agrees that specific allocations in areas covered by Aire Valley Area Action Plan should be brought forward in that document and not be considered as part of this consultation.

In other locations, in considering whether to allocate specific sites outside of existing centres for retail and other Town Centre uses, the Council will need to undertake a sequential assessment in accordance with the requirements of NPPF paragraph 23. In this respect, it should be recognised that Victoria Gate represents a sequentially preferable City Centre location for new retail development and is fully supported in the emerging Core Strategy. Any sequential assessment will be required to include this site.

The NPPF (paragraph 23) is clear that if in-centre or edge-of-centre sites cannot be identified, then local planning authorities should set policies for meeting needs in other locations that are well connected to the centre. There is no requirement in the NPPF to allocate sites in out-of-centre locations.

Hammerson considers that Policy P8 of the emerging Core Strategy provides an appropriate policy basis against which such schemes should be assessed (subject to the amendments as detailed in our representations to the Core Strategy).

In preparing the Publication Draft version of the Plan, it is not therefore appropriate to consider the allocation of any specific sites for retail development in out-of-centre locations, as this would not be consistent with the NPPF and would not be considered sound.

Representation ID: REP05724      Question Ref: General comment

Retail

Retail – Summary Paper

Hammerson supports the general aim of the Council set out in the Retail Summary Paper to protect and improve shopping centres, in particular:

- ☐ Enhancing the City Centre as the main regional shopping centre; and
- ☐ Focussing new shops in existing shopping centres (a 'centres first' approach).

Hammerson trusts that the above, along with the overall strategic aims and objectives in the emerging Core Strategy, will be reflected in future iterations of the SAP.

# General Comments

**Name: Colin, Ryk, Sandy Campbell, Downes, Lay**

**Representor No: PRS05148**

Representation ID: REP06235      Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Employment issues and options.

In Otley it should be recognised that there are a large number of small to medium sized businesses (2000+ at the last count) who provide a range of employment opportunities. The Council has identified a possible new employment site but has no clear proposals to prevent the loss of existing sites. We would make the following comments.

1. Policies should be introduced to encourage and protect employment on existing sites.
2. New employment in existing centres should be encouraged. Particularly small scale enterprises.
3. Development of super-fast broadband should be encouraged.

Representation ID: REP06239      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Greenspace issue and options.

Greenspace is important to the wellbeing of all residents of Leeds. Otley is perceived as a part of the city which because it is surrounded by green belt has an excess of greenspace. Unfortunately this does not reflect the reality that much of the area is not accessible and therefore it should not be seen as an excuse for failing to create new public spaces. We appreciate the work which has gone into identifying existing areas but there should be a presumption in favour of creating more usable space, particularly by developers (rather than refurbishing existing). We strongly disagree with the documents use of the words "Surplus". It is said there are surplus allotments in the area but with several hundred names on waiting lists this cannot be so. Surplus in the LDF context seems to mean more than other areas so policy should to increase all rather than only in certain areas. We would like to make the following comments.

1. The Chevin is a cross district park rather than local one.
2. Wharfemeadows has one of the highest visitor numbers of any park in Leeds and needs to be regarded as a district wide resource. This leaves the rest of the area with limited other "park" space.
3. There should be a clear policy in favour of the provision of new parks.
4. There should be clear provision for new playing fields (including bowling greens), equipped children's play areas, allotments, and small amenity areas in housing developments.
5. The role of the Chevin and Wharfemeadows as district resources should be recognised and they should be managed as such.
6. No existing green space should be sold off to pay for improvements /maintenance of other areas.

Representation ID: REP06242      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Housing issues and options - general comments -

As a medieval market town development in Otley has been constrained by the need to use routes which follow / cross the river. There have been no major infrastructure works which recognised the changes which have taken place in the last century (except the building of half a bypass and closure of the railway) and the constraints remain. Local services and infrastructure are at capacity and there seems little or no recognition of this in the Council's proposals.

We should like to make the following comments.

1. As a general principle we believe the premise on which the housing numbers is based is flawed in that it makes wrong assumptions concerning population, demand and ability of developers to build.
2. We also believe it fails to deal with the questions of sustainability in that it makes no provision for infrastructure development, (schools, services, public transport, roads etc.) but seems to assume that the existing networks will cope with any additional demand.
3. We believe there should be a presumption against loss of green fields in favour of re-use of existing brown field sites.
4. If there has to be some new housing it should reflect the needs of the local population rather than the profit margins of house builders. The Council/developers should provide an evidence base for the need for a development.

Gravel extraction – recognition needs to be given to impact of significant gravel extraction east of Otley which is assumed in the LDF Minerals Policy. If this takes place then highways impacts will have to be assessed (though it may be feasible to remove via a reconnection to the rail network). Restoration work would need to be managed to provide a resource similar to the existing sites in the district rather than a site for the dumping of materials from across the district.

Representation ID: REP07310      Question Ref: E5

Employment

3. We cannot see the need for and do not support the proposals for an industrial estate to the north of the airport.

Representation ID: REP07310      Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Employment issues and options.

In Aireborough it should be recognised that there are a large number of small to medium sized businesses who provide a range of employment opportunities. The Council has identified possible new employment sites but has no clear proposals to prevent the loss of existing sites.

We would make the following comments.

1. Policies should be introduced to encourage and protect employment on existing sites.
2. New employment in existing centres should be encouraged. Particularly small scale enterprises.

Representation ID: REP07315      Question Ref: G2

Greenspace

6. No existing green space should be sold off to pay for improvements / maintenance of other areas.

# General Comments

**Name: Colin, Ryk, Sandy Campbell, Downes, Lay**

**Representor No: PRS05148**

Representation ID: REP07315      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Greenspace issue and options.

Greenspace is important to the wellbeing of all residents of Leeds. Aireborough is perceived as a part of the city which because it is surrounded by green belt has an excess of greenspace. Unfortunately this does not reflect the reality that much of the area is not accessible and therefore it should not be seen as an excuse for failing to create new public spaces.

We appreciate the work which has gone into identifying existing areas but there should be a presumption in favour of creating more usable space, particularly by developers (rather than refurbishing existing).

We would like to make the following comments.

1. The Chevin is a district park rather than local one.

2. Yeadon Tarn has one of the highest visitor numbers of any park in Leeds and needs to be regarded as a district wide resource. This leaves the rest of the area with limited other "park" space.

3. There should be a clear policy in favour of the provision of new parks.

4. There should be clear provision for new playing fields (including bowling greens), equipped children's play areas, allotments, and small amenity areas in housing developments.

5. The role of the Chevin and Yeadon Tarn as district resource should be recognised and they should be managed as such.

Representation ID: REP07321      Question Ref: H7

Housing

1255A Banksfield Mount, Yeadon. Agree site should not be developed for the reasons stated.

Representation ID: REP07321      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Housing issues and options

Yeadon, as part of the Aireborough (and the wider Aire/Wharfe Valley) area has seen a significant amount of development over the last few years with little if any additions to the support infrastructure these developments need. These developments have put an intolerable strain on local services which are all running at or in some cases beyond accepted capacity. There seems to be little or no recognition of this in the Council's proposals. We should like to make the following comments. 1. As a general principle we believe the premise on which the housing numbers is based is flawed in that it makes wrong assumptions concerning population, demand and ability of developers to build.

2. We also believe it fails to deal with the questions of sustainability in that it makes no provision for infrastructure development, (schools, services, public transport, roads etc) but seems to assume that the existing networks will cope with any additional demand.

3. We believe there should be a presumption against loss of green fields in favour of re-use of existing brown field sites.

4. If there has to be some new housing it should reflect the needs of the local population rather than the profit margins of house builders. The Council/developers should provide an evidence base for the need for a development.

5. There needs to be recognition of the scale of recent housing developments in the area.

6. There needs to be recognition of the number of permissions which have not been built out (eg Highroyds).

7. There needs to be recognition of the high level of windfall sites which have come on the market in recent years.

# General Comments

**Name: Town Centre Securities Ltd (TCS)**

**Representor No: PRS05151**

Representation ID: REP05728      Question Ref: CCR3

Retail

TCS object to the proposed western extent of the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) as shown on Plan 2.2b and consider that the PSA should be extended to include the property occupied by Lloyds TSB. It is appropriate to include the property within the PSA for the following reasons:

- It operates as an integral part of the shopping area and an important part of the PSA;
- The main frontage and customer access to the property is from Bond Street which leads into Commercial Street, which is located within the PSA in its entirety except for the property occupied by Lloyds TSB and the adjacent NatWest and Caffé Nero;
- The building has a ground floor retail frontage, which is within the A use class. Banks and services are integral to the City Centre and there are a number of examples along Commercial Street which fall within the PSA;
- The current use of the property contributes to the significant footfall in this commercial area; and
- Park Row forms a natural barrier between this pedestrianised entrance to the PSA and main business district in Leeds City Centre.

Proposed Amendment to the PSA

TCS however seek to amend the boundary of the existing PSA to extend to Park Row encompassing the Lloyds TSB building for the reasons set out below.

The property occupied by Lloyds TSB currently operates as a key part of the PSA, due to its function and location. As such it is entirely appropriate to extend the PSA boundary to incorporate the site.

The property is located on the junction of Bond Street and Park Row. However, the bank's main frontage and only customer access is from Bond Street, on the unit's north eastern corner, where it meets Lower Basinghall Street.

Bond Street is a pedestrianised street which runs east through the City Centre, where it leads onto Commercial Street, crosses Briggate and becomes Kirkgate as it runs towards the railway line. It is a key and active thoroughfare and integral part of the retail and commercial area of the City Centre. The whole of Bond Street and surrounding area is located within the PSA, with the exception of the Lloyd's building unit and NatWest and Caffé Nero located opposite.

There is no difference between the public realm of the PSA on Bond Street and the public realm which is located adjacent to but outside the PSA. The retailing function and character of the area within the PSA is consistent with the adjacent area (i.e. the properties occupied by Lloyds TSB, NatWest and Caffé Nero) and the boundary should therefore be amended as such.

The location and use of the property generates significant footfall in this Proposed Amendment to the PSA

TCS however seek to amend the boundary of the existing PSA to extend to Park Row encompassing the Lloyds TSB building for the reasons set out below.

The property occupied by Lloyds TSB currently operates as a key part of the PSA, due to its function and location. As such it is entirely appropriate to extend the PSA boundary to incorporate the site.

The property is located on the junction of Bond Street and Park Row. However, the bank's main frontage and only customer access is from Bond Street, on the unit's north eastern corner, where it meets Lower Basinghall Street.

Bond Street is a pedestrianised street which runs east through the City Centre, where it leads onto Commercial Street, crosses Briggate and becomes Kirkgate as it runs towards the railway line. It is a key and active thoroughfare and integral part of the retail and commercial area of the City Centre. The whole of Bond Street and surrounding area is located within the PSA, with the exception of the Lloyd's building unit and NatWest and Caffé Nero located opposite.

There is no difference between the public realm of the PSA on Bond Street and the public realm which is located adjacent to but outside the PSA. The retailing function and character of the area within the PSA is consistent with the adjacent area (i.e. the properties occupied by Lloyds TSB, NatWest and Caffé Nero) and the boundary should therefore be amended as such.

The location and use of the property generates significant footfall in this commercial area, thus reiterating its key retailing role within the City Centre. The entrance to Lloyds TSB faces the entrance to the Tesco Metro on Bond Street, which is located within the PSA. The relationship between the property occupied by Lloyds and the adjacent properties are shown on the photographs enclosed with these representations.

The current use of the property at ground floor is consistent with the PSA, by way of providing a retail service (Use Class A2). All buildings within Use Class A form an integral part of the PSA.

Bond Street is of retail / commercial character and is pedestrianised up to where it meets Park Row. This is a main vehicular route running north to south, which therefore forms a natural barrier for the PSA, as opposed to the arbitrary boundary proposed in the Site Allocations Plan. This is also a boundary between the commercial area to the east of Park Row and the 'business district' to the west.

We are not seeking any amendments to the proposed frontages or associated policies. The Council allows for the inclusion of sites within the PSA which do not have Primary or Secondary frontages.

See also representation submitted for plan of amendments to PSA

Representation ID: REP05728      Question Ref: CCR4

Retail

TCS do not object to the extent of the Primary or Secondary Frontage. We are not seeking any amendments to the proposed frontages or associated policies

# General Comments

---

**Name: Threadneedle Property Investments**

**Representor No: PRS05155**

Representation ID: REP05737      Question Ref: CCR3

Retail

The Corn Exchange is allocated within the draft City Centre Primary Shopping Area Ground Floor Frontages Plan, as being within the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) and with its ground floor indicated as a Primary Shopping Frontage (PSF) designation.

Indigo support the continued designation of the Corn Exchange within the PSA, continuing its designation from the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (UDP), and recognising the role it plays to the City Centre. However, Indigo Planning suggest that its allocation as Primary Shopping Frontage (PFS) is no longer appropriate.

It is therefore sought that the Corn Exchange is allocated within the PSA but is not allocated any frontage designation.

Representation ID: REP05737      Question Ref: CCR4

Retail

Firstly, confirmation is sought as to which floor of the Corn Exchange is meant by "ground floor", as noted on the plan. The UDP identifies there to be three floors within the Corn Exchange; basement, ground and first. Confirmation is sought that, for consistency, ground floor is the same as that previously allocated i.e the middle level known as the Concourse Level.

However, regardless of the above, Indigo Planning feels that it is inappropriate for the ground floor to be allocated for PSF.

The amount of non-A1 uses within both the PFS and SSF are controlled by a threshold which permits a certain percentage of retail frontage to be used for purposes other than A1 retail. These thresholds are carried forward from the UDP. Within the PSF only 20% of the street frontage may be used for non-A1 uses, and within the SSF this is reduced to 50% of non-A1 uses.

The uses permitted within the SSF do therefore allow more flexibility, and allow a wider mix of uses, albeit still to a controlled threshold. The Corn Exchange is unlike the other covered shopping centres in Leeds listed within the draft Site Allocations document (including Core, Trinity, St Johns, Merrion and the soon to be developed Victoria Gate) by the nature of the operators it attracts, namely independent and niche retailers rather than high street retailers. It is also attractive to café and restaurant operators.

The Corn Exchange was until recently anchored by Anthony's Piazza restaurant and associated uses within the lowest level of the Corn Exchange (known as Piazza Level) However Anthony's have very recently ceased trading and vacated the Corn Exchange. The agents are seeking replacement tenants.

In recent months, Trinity Shopping Centre has opened, attracting new retailers to the City and displacing existing retailers from the City Centre. Victoria Gate (formerly known as the Harewood/Eastgate Quarter development) is also anticipated to start development in spring 2014.

In order to ensure the continued vital use of the building, the Corn Exchange would benefit from increased flexibility for the uses permitted on all levels. It is therefore sought that the Corn Exchange is allocated within the PSA but is not allocated any frontage designation.

If the Council consider it necessary to allocate the ground floor, it is suggested that at most it should be designated as SSF, in order that this level can be used for a wider mix of uses than those permitted as PSF, and it is not constricted to the A1 threshold proposed.

The draft Site Allocations document identifies at paragraph 2.2.9 of Volume 2 that some areas should not be allocated frontage policies: "It is also proposed that some parts of the Primary Shopping Area have no defined frontage policy, creating flexibility to accommodate leisure and entertainment uses".

The Council therefore already recognises that there is a requirement for some areas of the City Centre to remain flexible. We consider the Corn Exchange to be one of them.

There is no intention on the part of Threadneedle to actively seek a lower level of retail activity within the Corn Exchange – on the contrary. However, given the very dynamic level of activity and change within the Leeds retail sector and property market and the likelihood of significant change in the future arising from Trinity and the proposed Victoria Gate development, flexibility of use will potentially be vital in securing the active use of Corn Exchange for the future should market conditions dictate the need for a shift away from retail.

In relation to the Balcony and Piazza Levels further clarification is needed. The SAP Issues and Options City Centre Primary Shopping Area Ground Floor Frontages map indicates by that title that the proposed frontages relate to ground floor premises only. As noted above does this mean that the PSF proposal for Corn Exchange relates to Concourse Level only? In parallel with this, what is intended for the Balcony and Piazza Levels? Given the more limited accessibility and past difficulties in securing occupation of units within the Balcony Level it is suggested that there should be no protected frontage at Balcony Level.

Similarly, given the form of units within the lower Piazza Level and the recent cessation of use of the underpinning A3 restaurant use it is considered by TPI that there should be no frontage protection for this part of the Corn Exchange.

---

**Name: Jonny Shaw**

**Representor No: PRS05156**

Representation ID: REP05735      Question Ref: H10

Housing

New site

We would also propose that in the event further development was required, it could take place on the edges of Bramhope, for example in the 10 acre field opposite Hilton Grange (Title WYK850264 as per accompanying plan), adjacent to both Harrogate Road and Old Lane. This would have the advantage of keeping local traffic away from the village centre and routing commuting traffic along the Harrogate Road, A658. It is opposite a recent residential development on the edge of the village.

# General Comments

**Name: Jim & June Fell**

**Representor No: PRS05158**

Representation ID: REP06824      Question Ref: H4

Housing

Sites 3033, 1104 & 2162 - Amber to Red

Rawdon has its own uniquely picturesque appeal and charm. In addition the longstanding properties, some dating back to the 17th century, currently in the Rawdon area are set in beautiful landscape. The roads that run through the village do not immediately do justice to the hidden charms of the fields, woods and hedgerows that make Rawdon a designated green belt area. These same woods and fields are teeming with wildlife and plant life that will be decimated by the necessary clearance of land to build such a huge number of houses. The Clear demarcation line currently in existence between Leeds and Bradford will be consumed, leaving only a huge characterless urban sprawl.

The Increased urbanisation of Rawdon will place further intolerable strain on our already overcrowded roads. At the moment the A65 becomes gridlocked each day at both rush hour periods, with little reduction in busy traffic flow throughout the day and night, with its attendant noise pollution.

Apperley Lane, which is in effect an internal road from Bradford and parts of West Leeds, to the airport, already experiences huge volumes of traffic. Queuing vehicles can spread almost from the Greengates traffic lights on the A658 to the roundabout that intersects the A65 and beyond.

Presumably a further 654 homes would cater mainly for families, with the potential for 2 or more cars per household. This could literally add a further 1300 cars to the roads at busy times. It is inconceivable that this would work and it could bring the area to a standstill. The A65 does not start at Rawdon, but brings traffic from Ilkley and beyond to the centres of Leeds and Bradford every day. Motorists and travellers will therefore find shortcuts through the tiny streets and narrow lanes , thus increasing the potential risk of accidents to young children and vulnerable older adults

Rawdon currently experiences a huge strain on already overcrowded public services. Doctors and dentists have full books and long Waiting lists. Schools are overcrowded. There are no plans in place to build additional facilities for health and education. The welfare services in Rawdon at this time are stretched to capacity, with waiting lists for community care, daytime treatment centres plus residential and nursing homes overwhelmed by demand, meaning that people need to go further afield to out of area resources.

The little London area, Low Hall and Highfield Farm have a higher than average percentage of listed buildings, some of which date back to the 17th Century. Development of green fields and further urbanisation in such a unique area will have a long term and everlasting negative effect of our environment. Our local heritage will inevitably be irrevocably destroyed

The plan to build such a vast number of additional homes on numerous sites in Rawdon , which will impinge in such a major way as outlined above seems senseless and irrational at a time when Leeds currently has 5000 empty and derelict homes crying out for development

# General Comments

**Name: Archbold Holdings Limited**

**Representor No: PRS05161**

Representation ID: REP05736      Question Ref: H10

Housing

## LEEDS SITES ALLOCATIONS PLAN ISSUES AND OPTIONS

These representations have been prepared by Barton Willmore on behalf of Archbold Holdings Limited ("Our Client") in relation to the Archbold Holdings Site at Albert Road in Morley (hereafter referred to as 'the Site'). The Site has not been put forward for consideration as part of the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and has not therefore been considered as part of the Sites Allocation DPD. Archbold Holdings Limited can confirm that the site is available, suitable and deliverable, and would request that consideration is given to the allocation of the Site.

### Background

The Sites Allocations DPD will form part of Leeds City Council's development plan and will allocate sufficient sites to meet the District's housing, employment and retail needs throughout the next 15 years, in accordance with the Council's overarching strategic document, the Core Strategy.

The Issues and Options draft outlines the Council's initial ideas for the potential allocations to meet the Council's needs and the comments of the general public and relevant stakeholders are sought regarding the initial allocations until 29th July 2013.

In order to assess the sites that have been put forward for residential use the Council have adopted a traffic lighting system to identify the most suitable sites. The sites have been listed in one of the following categories:

- Light Green — the site is either allocated or there is an existing planning permission for development of the site;
- Dark Green — sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing;
- Amber — sites which have potential but issues or not favoured as green sites; and
- Red — sites not considered to be suitable for allocation.

The sites included in the Allocations DPD have been identified from previous proposals and representations made to the Council's Call for Sites and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The Site has never previously been submitted to the Council for consideration and therefore is not identified on the plans as a red, amber or green site. This lack of previous submission should not however prejudice the sites ability to be considered in the future. Morley is located within the Outer South West housing area where it is proposed to deliver 7,200 new homes throughout the next 15 years. The Allocations DPD identifies that there are currently 1,614 dwellings to be built from existing permissions and allocations which leaves a residual target of 5,586 dwellings. The dark green sites provide a total yield of 4,154 units whilst the amber sites provide a total of 5,499 units. Combined, this gives a potential yield of 9,653 units, double the actual requirement.

It should be noted that of the 4,154 units from dark green sites, 1,337 are from sites located within the Green Belt and of the 5,499 amber sites, 3,457 are located within the Green Belt.

The Site comprises previously developed land located within the existing development limits and as such is a sequentially preferable site to those currently located within the Green Belt.

It is demonstrated below that the Site is suitable, achievable and available and taking this into account together with the fact it is a previously developed site within the settlement boundary, it should be considered suitable and sequentially preferable to be allocated for residential purposes.

### The Site

The Site is located on the north eastern edge of Morley and measures approximately 3.2 hectares in area. It is located off Albert Road which runs along the southern boundary of the Site which provides access to Morley town centre and the A653 (Dewsbury Road) which provides access to the M621 and M62 motorways.

Morley is a large suburb located directly to the south-west of Leeds City Centre. The town consists predominantly of residential housing estates but benefits from a large range of services, facilities and employment opportunities provided by an industrial estate running along its southern boundary. The town is bound to the north by the M621, to the south and west by the M62 motorway and to the east by open fields and a residential housing estate.

The Site itself is located within a residential area with properties located to the south, east and west. To the north of the Site lies an existing industrial site with a railway line and agricultural land located beyond. There are a number of mature trees located along the boundary of the Site which ensures that it is well screened from public views.

The Site is within comfortable walking distance of Morley train station which provides regular services to Leeds, Huddersfield and Manchester. In addition, there are bus stops within approximately 135 metres that provide services to Morley town centre, Leeds, Huddersfield and a number of other neighbouring towns and villages.

The Site is therefore very sustainable.

Our Client owns the site and occupies the western half. This half is run as an accident repair centre with land at the back being utilized for HGV parking. The eastern half of the site was used as a HGV workshop, however in 2011 the site was vacated. It has since been on the market but no interest has been shown.

### Planning Policy Context

The National Planning Policy Framework ("the NPPF")

The NPPF was published on 27th March 2012 and is now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. It contains a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which with regards to plan-making is taken to mean:

- "local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet development needs of their area;

Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:

Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or  
Specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted."

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF outlines the twelve core land-use planning principles that should underpin planmaking.

The third principle states that planning should "proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the

# General Comments

**Name: Archbold Holdings Limited**

**Representor No: PRS05161**

country needs". The eighth principle states that planning should "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value". Previously developed land is described within the NPPF as "land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure.

The NPPF requires local planning authority's to boost significantly the supply of housing within their area by identifying deliverable sites. The Framework defines deliverable sites as follows:

"To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable".

Draft Core Strategy

The Leeds Core Strategy has been submitted to the Planning Inspector with an Examination in Public scheduled to be heard in October 2013. The Core Strategy sets the strategic framework for development in Leeds over the next fifteen years, including the level of development required, the location of development and the mechanisms to deliver the requisite development. With regards to the Site, the Core Strategy identifies Morley as an appropriate area for further development and identifies the required number of homes to be allocated across the district.

Site Assessment

The principle of development

The Leeds Core Strategy identifies the need to release Green Belt land in order to deliver the requisite number of new homes across the district during the plan period. In accordance with the Framework Very Special Circumstances must be demonstrated to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt for development purposes. Our Client acknowledges that across the district there is insufficient land to provide the required level of housing on both previously developed sites and green field sites outside of the Green Belt, therefore leading to a need to remove land from the Green Belt.

In accordance with the Framework the Council should look to allocate brownfield land within settlements prior to considering sites located within the Green Belt. The Framework sets out twelve core planning principles that should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. Principle 8 states that planning should "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value". By following the sequential approach, whereby suitable brownfield field sites should be considered first, it reduces the amount of Green Belt land that would need to be released in order to deliver the districts housing requirements.

This guidance is transposed into Spatial Policy 1 of the emerging Core Strategy, which states that "settlements within the hierarchy will guide identification of land for development, with priority given in the following order:

- Previously developed land and buildings within the settlement;
- Other suitable infill sites within the relevant settlement; and
- Key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement.

There is therefore a clear indication that any previously developed sites which are demonstrated as suitable and deliverable should be included as a green site, given the Councils hierarchy.

The Councils assessment included in the consultation document is based on the sites provided from the landowners through the SHLAA and is based as a result of deducting the deliverable and suitable sites not in the green belt from the overall requirement. As a previously developed site outside of the Green Belt our Client's site is clearly sequentially preferential for allocation. Therefore provided that there are no overriding reasons which would render it unsuitable and/or undeliverable the site should be considered as a green site.

Suitability

The Council assessment of other sites included within the Allocations DPD the Council have utilised an assessment to consider both the physical and policy aspects of a site, therefore the following assessment is made having regard to both aspects.

Policy Considerations

The Site is located within the development limits of Morley and the development of the site for residential purposes would comply with saved policies contained within the UDPR in addition to the guidance contained within the NPPF. Furthermore, the emerging policies contained within the Core Strategy would also be supportive of residential development in this location.

Physical Considerations

There are a number of physical constraints that could potentially impact upon the suitability of a site and these are addressed below in relation to the Site.

- Flood Risk and Drainage — The Site is identified on the Environment Agency indicative flood maps as being located within Flood Zone 1, the lowest risk of flooding. In accordance with the Framework and the guidance note to PPS25 which remains extant, the site is considered sequentially preferable to any sites located within flood zones 2 and 3 and does not require an exception test to be provided.
- Ecology — The redevelopment of the Site will involve the demolition of a building that may provide potential for bat roosts. In addition, there are mature trees that bound the Site that may have potential to support foraging ground for bats. A detailed mitigation strategy could be prepared to ensure that protected species, if present, would not be impacted upon.
- Trees — There are a number of mature conifer trees that border the Site. A scheme could be developed that ensures the trees are retained and adequate separation distances are maintained to ensure that they would not be adversely impacted upon by the proposal.
- Cultural Heritage — The site is not located within an identified Conservation Area, historic park or battlefield. There are no listed buildings within the Site or within close proximity and the redevelopment of this site will not impact upon the historic environment.
- Highways Safety — The existing vehicular access to the Site is engineered to a high standard due to the existing use at the Site and already accommodates significant vehicular movements. The access offers adequate visibility in both directions onto Albert Road and it is considered that a safe access and egress point can be designed to ensure that there is no detriment to highways safety of either or future users of the highway. Indeed, it is considered that highways safety could be improved as the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes would lead to the reduction of HGVs utilising Albert Road.



# General Comments

---

**Name: Archbold Holdings Limited**

**Representor No: PRS05161**

• Land Contamination — The Site's historic use for industrial purposes means that there may be potential contaminants on Site and intrusive surveys will be required to demonstrate that future occupants of the Site would not be harmed. A detailed mitigation strategy could be prepared, if contamination is present, to ensure that potential residents would not be impacted upon.

There are no known physical constraints that would prevent the site being developed and as such the site is suitable for development.

## Availability

The SHLAA states that in order for a site to be available, it must be free from any legal or ownership problems which could prevent or delay development and how long it would take to overcome the problems.

The Site is within the sole ownership of Archbold Holdings Limited. As previously discussed the western half is employment use, however our Client is able to provide alternative premises for the existing business within the locality to ensure that allocation of the site will not result in a loss of employment opportunities. The eastern half of the property has been vacant since 2011 and is expected to remain vacant for the foreseeable future.

## Achievability

In terms of assessing the achievability of a site the SHLAA states that it concerns whether and when there is likely to be a market for dwellings in the locality taking into account of any cost factors involved in overcoming physical constraints.

The Site is considered to be achievable for residential development as there is a reasonable prospect that the Site can be developed within the plan period.

## Summary

The Site has not previously been put forward for consideration within the SHLAA, hence its omission from the Councils draft document. The Site is not constrained by existing planning policy at a local and/or national level and there are no physical constraints that would prevent the Site from being developed, subject to mitigation measures being implemented if necessary.

The Site is available and achievable and it is considered to be deliverable within the lifetime of the plan.

The Site is located within the development limits of Morley and is not within the Green Belt and due to the historic use of the Site for industrial purposes it constitutes previously developed land, therefore it is considered to be one of the most sequentially preferable sites in the plan and should take clear priority in accordance with Spatial Policy 1.

It is noted that site no. 563 at Albert Road, Morley has been assessed as dark green within the Sites Allocation DPD and the Council have provided the following summary: "Site is currently in employment use however could be brought forward for residential development". Given the inclusion of this site with similar opportunities and constraints it is considered that the Site should also be allocated for residential purposes in any future documents.

We trust the above representations will be fully considered in determining the most appropriate sites to include in any future versions of the Site Allocations DPD.

# General Comments

**Name: Archbold Holdings Limited**

**Representor No: PRS05161**

Representation ID: REP05745      Question Ref: H10

Housing

These representations have been prepared by Barton Willmore on behalf of Archbold Holdings Limited ("our Client") in relation to the Archbold Holdings Site at Wide Lane in Morley (hereafter referred to as 'the Site').

The Site has not been put forward for consideration as part of the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and has not therefore been considered as part of the Sites Allocation DPD. Archbold Holdings Limited can confirm that the site is available, suitable and deliverable, and would request that consideration is given to the allocation of the Site.

## Background

The Sites Allocations DPD will form part of Leeds City Council's development plan and will allocate sufficient sites to meet the District's housing, employment and retail needs throughout the next 15 years, in accordance with the Council's overarching strategic document, the Core Strategy.

The Issues and Options draft outlines the Council's initial ideas for the potential allocations to meet the Council's needs and the comments of the general public and relevant stakeholders are sought regarding the initial allocations until 29th July 2013.

In order to assess the sites that have been put forward for residential use the Council have adopted a traffic lighting system to identify the most suitable sites. The sites have been listed in one of the following categories:

- Light Green — the site is either allocated or there is an existing planning permission for development of the site;
- Dark Green — sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing;
- Amber — sites which have potential but issues or not favoured as green sites; and
- Red — sites not considered to be suitable for allocation.

The sites included in the Allocations DPD have been identified from previous proposals and representations made to the Council's Call for Sites and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The Site has never previously been submitted to the Council for consideration and therefore is not identified on the plans as a red, amber or green site. This lack of previous submission should not however prejudice the sites ability to be considered in the future.

Morley is located within the Outer South West housing area where it is proposed to deliver 7,200 new homes throughout the next 15 years. The Allocations DPD identifies that there are currently 1,614 dwellings to be built from existing permissions and allocations which leaves a residual target of 5,586 dwellings. The dark green sites provide a total yield of 4,154 units whilst the amber sites provide a total of 5,499 units. Combined, this gives a potential yield of 9,653 units, double the actual requirement.

It should be noted that of the 4,154 units from dark green sites, 1,337 are from sites located within the Green Belt and of the 5,499 amber sites, 3,457 are located within the Green Belt.

The Site comprises previously developed land located within the existing development limits and as such is a sequentially preferable site to those currently located within the Green Belt.

It is demonstrated below that the Site is suitable, achievable and available and taking this into account together with the fact it is a previously developed site within the settlement boundary, it should be considered suitable and sequentially preferable to be allocated for residential purposes.

## The Site

### Site Appraisal

The Site is located centrally within Morley and is adjacent to the defined town centre and measures approximately 0.08 hectares in area. The key services within Morley town centre are located within easy walking distance of the Site. It is located off Wide Lane which runs along the northern boundary of the Site and provides access to Morley town centre and the A653 (Dewsbury Road) which provides access to the M621 and M62 motorways.

Morley is a large suburb located directly to the south-west of Leeds City Centre. The town consists predominantly of residential housing estates but benefits from a large range of services, facilities and employment opportunities provided by an industrial estate running along its southern boundary. The town is bound to the north by the M621, to the south and west by the M62 motorway and to the east by open fields and a residential housing estate.

The Site itself is located within an area that is partly residential and partly industrial. Residential development is located to the north and east, whilst industrial development adjoins the site to the south east. Rods Mills Lane bounds the Site to the south. There are a number of mature trees located to the south of the Site surrounding Rods Mill.

### Planning History

Planning permission has previously been granted for residential development at the Site. In 2008 an application for the demolition of the existing workshop and the construction of a part 3 and part 4 storey block of 12 flats (07/06905/FU) was approved by Leeds City Council.

Following the granting of planning permission a High Court challenge was made against the planning permission by a neighbouring land owner and the permission was subsequently quashed by the Judge on the following grounds:

- In determining the application the Council stated that one of the main issues in the consideration of the application would be the potential contamination of the site given its historic use. The application was approved under delegation and conditions were attached require work to be undertaken to determine whether there were any potential containments on site. The Judge ruled that the Council had erred in this regard as the applicant should have been requested to demonstrate that contamination was not a constraint prior to the determination of the application;
- In addition, the Judge found that the Council had erred in trying to secure the financial contribution for open space via condition.

The Council have yet to determine the application following the Judge's decision to quash the original planning application.

# General Comments

**Name: Archbold Holdings Limited**

**Representor No: PRS05161**

It should be noted that the quashing of the application was not in relation to the merits of the scheme and relate solely to the procedures undertaken by the Council.

Planning Policy Context

The National Planning Policy Framework ("the NPPF")

The NPPF was published on 27th March 2012 and is now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. It contains a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which with regards to plan-making is taken to mean:

- "local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet development needs of their area;

- Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:

Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or Specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted."

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF outlines the twelve core land-use planning principles that should underpin plan-making. The third principle states that planning should "proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs". The eighth principle states that planning should "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value.

Previously developed land is described within the NPPF as "land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. The NPPF requires local planning authority's to boost significantly the supply of housing within their area by identifying deliverable sites. The Framework defines deliverable sites as follows:

"To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable".

Draft Core Strategy

The Leeds Core Strategy has been submitted to the Planning Inspector with an Examination in Public scheduled to be heard in October 2013. The Core Strategy sets the strategic framework for development in Leeds over the next fifteen years, including the level of development required, the location of development and the mechanisms to deliver the requisite development. With regards to the Site, the Core Strategy identifies Morley as an appropriate area for further development and identifies the required number of homes to be allocated across the district.

Site Assessment

The principle of development

The Leeds Core Strategy identifies the need to release Green Belt land in order to deliver the requisite number of new homes across the district during the plan period. In accordance with the Framework Very Special Circumstances must be demonstrated to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt for development purposes. Our Client acknowledges that across the district there is insufficient land to provide the required level of housing on both previously developed sites and green field sites outside of the Green Belt, therefore leading to a need to remove land from the Green Belt.

In accordance with the Framework the Council should look to allocate brownfield land within settlements prior to considering sites located within the Green Belt. The Framework sets out twelve core planning principles that should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. Principle 8 states that planning should "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value". By following the sequential approach, whereby suitable brownfield sites should be considered first, it reduces the amount of Green Belt land that would need to be released in order to deliver the districts housing requirements.

This guidance is transposed into Spatial Policy 1 of the emerging Core Strategy, which states that "settlements within the hierarchy will guide identification of land for development, with priority given in the following order:

- Previously developed land and buildings within the settlement;
- Other suitable infill sites within the relevant settlement;
- Key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement.

There is therefore a clear indication that any previously developed sites which are demonstrated as suitable and deliverable should be included as a green site, given the Councils hierarchy.

The Councils assessment included in the consultation document is based on the sites provided from the landowners through the SHLAA and is based as a result of deducting the deliverable and suitable sites not in the green belt from the overall requirement. As a previously developed site outside of the Green Belt our Client's site is clearly sequentially preferential for allocation. Therefore provided that there are no overriding reasons which would render it unsuitable and/or undeliverable the site should be considered as a green site.

Suitability

The Council assessment of other sites included within the Allocations DPD the Council have utilised an assessment to consider both the physical and policy aspects of a site, therefore the following assessment is made having regard to both aspects.

Policy Considerations

The Site is located within the development limits of Morley and the development of the site for residential purposes would comply with saved policies contained within the UDPR in addition to the guidance contained within the NPPF. Furthermore, the emerging policies contained within the Core Strategy would also be supportive of residential development in this location. Physical Considerations

# General Comments

**Name: Archbold Holdings Limited**

**Representor No: PRS05161**

There are a number of physical constraints that could potentially impact upon the suitability of a site and these are addressed below in relation to the Site.

- **Flood Risk and Drainage** — The Site is identified on the Environment Agency indicative flood maps as being located within Flood Zone 1, the lowest risk of flooding. In accordance with the Framework and the guidance note to PPS25 which remains extant, the site is considered sequentially preferable to any sites located within flood zones 2 and 3 and does not require an exception test to be provided.

- **Ecology** — The redevelopment of the Site will involve the demolition of a building that may provide potential for bat roosts. A detailed mitigation strategy could be prepared to ensure that protected species, if present, would not be impacted upon.

- **Trees** — There are no trees located within the Site. There are small shrubs located between the Site and Rods Mill Lane, however these will not be impacted upon by any proposed development.

- **Cultural Heritage** — The site is not located within an identified Conservation Area, historic park or battlefield. There are no listed buildings within the Site, although Rods Mills to the south west is listed. However, the Council have already considered the impact of development at this Site (which included a new 3 and 4 storey building) on the setting of the historic environment and it was concluded that the development would have no impact.

- **Highways Safety** — The existing vehicular access to the Site is located off Wide Lane. The access offers adequate visibility in both directions onto Wide Lane and it has been demonstrated previously that an acceptable vehicular access can be provided to the Site to serve at least twelve dwellings.

- **Land Contamination** — The Site's historic use for industrial purposes means that there may be potential contaminants on Site and intrusive surveys will be required to demonstrate that future occupants of the Site would not be harmed. A detailed mitigation strategy could be prepared, if contamination is present, to ensure that potential residents would not be impacted upon.

It is noted that contamination was raised as a potential issue by the Council when dealing with planning application 07/06905/FU. It is accepted that evidence will need to be provided prior to the Publication version of the Site Allocations DPD that the Site is not at risk from contamination; however at this stage it is not acceptable to not allocate the site on this basis.

To the best of our knowledge there are few other sites that have been put forward for consideration that have provided evidence in respect of contamination.

There are no known physical constraints that would prevent the site being developed and as such the site is suitable for development.

## Availability

The SHLAA states that in order for a site to be available, it must be free from any legal or ownership problems which could prevent or delay development and how long it would take to overcome the problems.

The Site is within the sole ownership of Archbold Holdings Limited and it is the owner's intention to redevelop the site and it is therefore available for development. The owner has clearly show their intention to develop the site by investing in the preparation and submission of planning applications in respect of the site.

## Achievability

In terms of assessing the achievability of a site the SHLAA states that it concerns whether and when there is likely to be a market for dwellings in the locality taking into account of any cost factors involved in overcoming physical constraints.

The Site is considered to be achievable for residential development as there is a reasonable prospect that the Site can be developed within the plan period.

## Summary

The Site has not previously been put forward for consideration within the SHLAA, hence its omission from the Councils draft document. The Site is not constrained by existing planning policy at a local and/or national level and there are no physical constraints that would prevent the Site from being developed, subject to mitigation measures being implemented if necessary.

The Site is available and achievable and it is considered to be deliverable within the lifetime of the plan.

The Site is located within the development limits of Morley and is not within the Green Belt and due to the historic use of the Site for industrial purposes it constitutes previously developed land, therefore it is considered to be one of the most sequentially preferable sites in the plan and should take clear priority in accordance with Spatial Policy 1.

# General Comments

**Name:** Archbold Holdings Limited

**Representor No:** PRS05161

**Representation ID:** REP07603      **Question Ref:** H10

Housing

On behalf of Archbold Holdings Limited in relation to the Archbold Holdings Site at Wide Lane in Morley.

The Site has not been put forward for consideration as part of the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and has not therefore been considered as part of the Sites Allocation DPD. This lack of previous submission should not however prejudice the sites ability to be considered in the future. Archbold Holdings Limited can confirm that the site is available, suitable and deliverable, and would request that consideration is given to the allocation of the Site.

Morley is located within the Outer South West housing area where it is proposed to deliver 7,200 new homes throughout the next 15 years. The Allocations DPD identifies that there are currently 1,614 dwellings to be built from existing permissions and allocations which leaves a residual target of 5,586 dwellings. The dark green sites provide a total yield of 4,154 units whilst the amber sites provide a total of 5,499 units. Combined, this gives a potential yield of 9,653 units, double the actual requirement. It should be noted that of the 4,154 units from dark green sites, 1,337 are from sites located within the Green Belt and of the 5,499 amber sites, 3,457 are located within the Green Belt.

The Site comprises previously developed land located within the existing development limits and as such is a sequentially preferable site to those currently located within the Green Belt.

The Site is located centrally within Morley and is adjacent to the defined town centre and measures approximately 0.08 hectares in area. The key services within Morley town centre are located within easy walking distance of the Site. It is located off Wide Lane which runs along the northern boundary of the Site and provides access to Morley town centre and the A653 (Dewsbury Road) which provides access to the M621 and M62 motorways.

The Site itself is located within an area that is partly residential and partly industrial. Residential development is located to the north and east, whilst industrial development adjoins the site to the south east. Rods Mills Lane bounds the Site to the south. There are a number of mature trees located to the south of the Site surrounding Rods Mill.

Planning History - Planning permission has previously been granted for residential development at the Site. In 2008 an application for the demolition of the existing workshop and the construction of a part 3 and part 4 storey block of 12 flats (07/06905/FU) was approved by Leeds City Council. Following the granting of planning permission a High Court challenge was made against the planning permission by a neighbouring land owner and the permission was subsequently quashed by the Judge on the following grounds:

- In determining the application the Council stated that one of the main issues in the consideration of the application would be the potential contamination of the site given its historic use. The application was approved under delegation and conditions were attached require work to be undertaken to determine whether there were any potential containments on site. The Judge ruled that the Council had erred in this regard as the applicant should have been requested to demonstrate that contamination was not a constraint prior to the determination of the application;
- In addition, the Judge found that the Council had erred in trying to secure the financial contribution for open space via condition.

The Council have yet to determine the application following the Judge's decision to quash the original planning application. It should be noted that the quashing of the application was not in relation to the merits of the scheme and relate solely to the procedures undertaken by the Council.

[Representation includes NPPF policies]

[Representation includes Core Strategy overview]

Our Client acknowledges that across the district there is insufficient land to provide the required level of housing on both previously developed sites and green field sites outside of the Green Belt. As a result of this there is therefore a requirement to remove land from the Green Belt to deliver new homes. The Councils assessment is based on the sites provided from the landowner through the SHLAA and is based as a result of deducting the deliverable and suitable sites not in the green belt from the overall requirement. As a previously developed site outside of the Green Belt our Client's site is clearly sequentially preferential for allocation. Therefore provided that there are no overriding reasons which would render it unsuitable and/or undeliverable the site should be considered as a green site.

## Suitability

Policy Considerations - The Site is located within the development limits of Morley and the development of the site for residential purposes would comply with saved policies contained within the UDPR in addition to the guidance contained within the NPPF. Furthermore, the emerging policies contained within the Core Strategy would also be supportive of residential development in this location.

Physical Considerations - There are a number of physical constraints that could potentially impact upon the suitability of a site and these are addressed below in relation to the Site. There are no known physical constraints that would prevent the site being developed and as such the site is suitable for development.

- Flood Risk and Drainage – The Site is identified on the Environment Agency indicative flood maps as being located within Flood Zone 1, the lowest risk of flooding. In accordance with the Framework and the guidance note to PPS25 which remains extant, the site is considered sequentially preferable to any sites located within flood zones 2 and 3 and does not require an exception test to be provided.
- Ecology – The redevelopment of the Site will involve the demolition of a building that may provide potential for bat roosts. A detailed mitigation strategy could be prepared to ensure that protected species, if present, would not be impacted upon.
- Trees – There are no trees located within the Site. There are small shrubs located between the Site and Rods Mill Lane, however these will not be impacted upon by any proposed development.
- Cultural Heritage – The site is not located within an identified Conservation Area, historic park or battlefield. There are no listed buildings within the Site, although Rods Mills to the south west is listed. However, the Council have already considered the impact of development at this Site (which included a new 3 and 4 storey building) on the setting of the historic environment and it was concluded that the development would have no impact.
- Highways Safety – The existing vehicular access to the Site is located off Wide Lane. The access offers adequate visibility in both directions onto Wide Lane and it has been demonstrated previously that an acceptable vehicular access can be provided to the Site to serve at least twelve dwellings.
- Land Contamination – The Site's historic use for industrial purposes means that there may be potential contaminants on Site and intrusive surveys will be required to demonstrate that future occupants of the Site would not be harmed. A detailed mitigation strategy could be prepared, if contamination is present, to ensure that potential residents would not be impacted upon.

It is noted that contamination was raised as a potential issue by the Council when dealing with planning application 07/06905/FU. It is accepted that evidence will need to be provided prior to the Publication version of the Site Allocations DPD that the Site is not at risk from contamination; however at this stage it is not acceptable to not allocate the site on this basis. To the best of our knowledge there are few other sites that have

# General Comments

---

**Name: Archbold Holdings Limited**

**Representor No: PRS05161**

been put forward for consideration that have provided evidence in respect of contamination.

## Availability

The SHLAA states that in order for a site to be available, it must be free from any legal or ownership problems which could prevent or delay development and how long it would take to overcome the problems. TThe Site is within the sole ownership of Archbold Holdings Limited and it is the owner's intention to redevelop the site and it is therefore available for development. The owner has clearly show their intention to develop the site by investing in the preparation and submission of planning applications in respect of the site.

## Achievability

In terms of assessing the achievability of a site the SHLAA states that it concerns whether and when there is likely to be a market for dwellings in the locality taking into account of any cost factors involved in overcoming physical constraints. The Site is considered to be achievable for residential development as there is a reasonable prospect that the Site can be developed within the plan period.

Current uses of the site - Workshops

gross – 8.08 ha

surrounding uses – housing and commercial

Planning applications - yes

Proposed use – 9 flats, 585 sq meters

Planning permission - 2015

Demolition/clearance - 2015

Commencement on site – 2016

Completion – 2016

20 dwellings per year.

# General Comments

**Name: Archbold Holdings Limited**

**Representor No: PRS05161**

Representation ID: REP07603      Question Ref: H10

Housing

On behalf of Archbold Holdings Limited in relation to the Archbold Accident Repair Centre located off Albert Road in Morley.

The Site has not been put forward for consideration as part of the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and has not therefore been considered as part of the Sites Allocation DPD. This lack of previous submission should not however prejudice the sites ability to be considered in the future. Archbold Holdings Limited can confirm that the site is available, suitable and deliverable, and would request that consideration is given to the allocation of the Site.

Morley is located within the Outer South West housing area where it is proposed to deliver 7,200 new homes throughout the next 15 years. The Allocations DPD identifies that there are currently 1,614 dwellings to be built from existing permissions and allocations which leaves a residual target of 5,586 dwellings. The dark green sites provide a total yield of 4,154 units whilst the amber sites provide a total of 5,499 units. Combined, this gives a potential yield of 9,653 units, double the actual requirement. It should be noted that of the 4,154 units from dark green sites, 1,337 are from sites located within the Green Belt and of the 5,499 amber sites, 3,457 are located within the Green Belt.

The Site comprises previously developed land located within the existing development limits and as such is a sequentially preferable site to those currently located within the Green Belt.

The Site is located on the north eastern edge of Morley and measures approximately 2.3 hectares in area. It is located off Albert Road which runs along the southern boundary of the Site which provides access to Morley town centre and the A653 (Dewsbury Road) which provides access to the M621 and M62 motorways. [See representation for site plans]. The Site itself is located within a residential area with properties located to the south, east and west. To the north of the Site lies an existing industrial site with a railway line and agricultural land located beyond. There are a number of mature trees located along the boundary of the Site which ensures that it is well screened from public views. Our Client currently own and occupy the Site, which is utilised as an accident repair centre. A large industrial building is located at the southern end of the Site within proximity of the site entrance, with the areas to the north of the building being used for open air storage.

[Representation includes NPPF policies]

[Representation includes Core Strategy overview]

Our Client acknowledges that across the district there is insufficient land to provide the required level of housing on both previously developed sites and green field sites outside of the Green Belt. As a result of this there is therefore a requirement to remove land from the Green Belt to deliver new homes. The Councils assessment is based on the sites provided from the landowner through the SHLAA and is based as a result of deducting the deliverable and suitable sites not in the green belt from the overall requirement. As a previously developed site outside of the Green Belt our Client's site is clearly sequentially preferential for allocation. Therefore provided that there are no overriding reasons which would render it unsuitable and/or undeliverable the site should be considered as a green site.

## Suitability

### Policy Considerations

The Site is located within the development limits of Morley and the development of the site for residential purposes would comply with saved policies contained within the UDPR in addition to the guidance contained within the NPPF. Furthermore, the emerging policies contained within the Core Strategy would also be supportive of residential development in this location.

### Physical Considerations

There are a number of physical constraints that could potentially impact upon the suitability of a site and these are addressed below in relation to the Site. There are no known physical constraints that would prevent the site being developed and as such the site is suitable for development.

- Flood Risk and Drainage – The Site is identified on the Environment Agency indicative flood maps as being located within Flood Zone 1, the lowest risk of flooding. In accordance with the Framework and the guidance note to PPS25 which remains extant, the site is considered sequentially preferable to any sites located within flood zones 2 and 3 and does not require an exception test to be provided.
- Ecology – The redevelopment of the Site will involve the demolition of a building that may provide potential for bat roosts. In addition, there are mature trees that bound the Site that may have potential to support foraging ground for bats. A detailed mitigation strategy could be prepared to ensure that protected species, if present, would not be impacted upon.
- Trees – There are a number of mature conifer trees that border the Site. A scheme could be developed that ensures the trees are retained and adequate separation distances are maintained to ensure that they would not be adversely impacted upon by the proposal.
- Cultural Heritage – The site is not located within an identified Conservation Area, historic park or battlefield. There are no listed buildings within the Site or within close proximity and the redevelopment of this site will not impact upon the historic environment.
- Highways Safety – The existing vehicular access to the Site is engineered to a high standard due to the existing use at the Site and already accommodates significant vehicular movements. The access offers adequate visibility in both directions onto Albert Road and it is considered that a safe access and egress point can be designed to ensure that there is no detriment to highways safety of either or future users of the highway. Indeed, it is considered that highways safety could be improved as the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes would lead to the reduction of HGVs utilising Albert Road.
- Land Contamination – The Site's historic use for industrial purposes means that there may be potential contaminants on Site and intrusive surveys will be required to demonstrate that future occupants of the Site would not be harmed. A detailed mitigation strategy could be prepared, if contamination is present, to ensure that potential residents would not be impacted upon.

## Availability

The SHLAA states that in order for a site to be available, it must be free from any legal or ownership problems which could prevent or delay development and how long it would take to overcome the problems. The Site is within the sole ownership of Archbold Holdings Limited and there are no ownership or legal agreements that would prevent the Site coming forward for development. The Site is currently in employment use, however our Client is able to provide alternative premises for the existing businesses within the locality to ensure that allocation of the site will not result in a loss of employment opportunities.

## Achievability

In terms of assessing the achievability of a site the SHLAA states that it concerns whether and when there is likely to be a market for dwellings in the locality taking into account of any cost factors involved in overcoming physical constraints. The Site is considered to be achievable for residential development as there is a reasonable prospect that the Site can be developed within the plan period.

It is noted that site no. 563 at Albert Road, Morley has been assessed as dark green within the Sites Allocation DPD and the Council have provided the following summary: "Site is currently in employment use however could be brought forward for residential development". Given the

# General Comments

---

**Name: Archbold Holdings Limited**

**Representor No: PRS05161**

inclusion of this site with similar opportunities and constraints it is considered that the Site should also be allocated for residential purposes in any future documents.

Current uses of the site - Vehicle Parking and Workshops

gross - 3.13 ha

surrounding uses – housing

No previous planning applications

Proposed use – 70 houses, 73,373 sq ft

Planning permission - 2015

Demolition/clearance - 2016

Commencement on site – 2016

Completion – 2017

30 dwellings per year.

---

**Name: Mandy Bowditch**

**Representor No: PRS05166**

Representation ID: REP05358      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I would like to register my strong objection to the proposed plans to build houses at sites along Gill Lane, Warm Lane, Greenside Farm and adjacent to the A658/Little London area in Rawdon/Yeadon area.

The reasons for my objections are:

- Loss of green belt – I don't believe that enough brown field sites have been considered fully for urban regeneration. Our local authorities should be considering these sites and putting forward plans for sustainable redevelopment and investing long term in these areas, building desirable places to live for the future. In addition there are an estimated 5000 houses sitting empty across the Leeds area. Development of the Highfold Farm site in particular will lead to further fields being lost as the precedent to build on this open land will have been set.
- Highways – The following roads are already massively over capacity – A65 Addingham to Leeds, A658 Yeadon to Greengates. There could be more than 1000 cars on the roads resulting in additional rush hour traffic and safety on roads would become an even greater issue – particularly where children are crossing for school. Warm Lane is narrow and the junction with the A658 cannot accommodate more traffic.
- Local services – the building 499 family houses in this area will impact enormously on:
  1. Local primary schools, Rawdon Littlemoor/Yeadon Westfield/SS Peter and Paul/Rufford Park/St Oswald's.
  2. Doctors surgeries, dentists, hospitals, ambulance services and fire stations.
- Heritage - The plans will have a detrimental effect on historic and listed buildings that are located within the proposed development area and on the Little London conservation area.

---

**Name: Michael & Stella Marie Langley**

**Representor No: PRS05167**

Representation ID: REP05751      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We were asked to answer a few questions. We too have questions we would like answering:

1. Aireborough is saturated with housing at the moment. We want to know if the new houses are built what about schooling/dentists/doctors, etc.? Schools are full to bursting, there is no chance of a dentist and having to wait weeks for a doctor or nurse appointment is not acceptable.
2. What will happen to the roads? A65 is gridlocked on a daily basis as can be Queensway, Henstow Lane on to the A65, Green Lane and Harrogate Road. Also Coppice Wood Avenue is always blocked by the junior school, very dangerous parking and is too narrow to be a through road.
3. Why have road traffic calming areas been put onto Queensway if there will be more traffic using it? These areas also create gridlocks at peak times. Many motorists sneak through, causing evasive action.
4. Why are there so many 'green belts' in the proposed sites? Why are areas 1254, 1186, 1326 & 1189 'sieved out'? What does 'sieved out' mean?
5. Why build more houses when there are so many houses up for sale in the Aireborough area, some for over a year? We have just moved and know that for a fact.
6. Why has Yeadon High Street got so many empty units/shops? I counted 9. Maybe the rates are too high - give them a chance, please.
7. Why don't the council concentrate on tidying up the area, develop sites left to rot? Kirkland House on Queensway is a perfect example. There are too many old schools in the area. Aireborough Leisure Center also looks tired. The people of the area deserve some leisure facilities and the kiddies deserve up-to-date schools.

We also noted that a certain farming family are at it again, wanting to let lovely greenbelt land, with wonderful habitat, be spoiled. How lovely it is to look out of your window and see deer running freely in the fields and watching the red kites flying over and resting in the nearby wood. As we mentioned, we have just moved, retired into a small bungalow with beautiful views and peace and quiet. Please leave it that way.

Can we just add that we only moved half a mile. We used to live on Stow Lane Gardens, Guiseley, LS20 and that a certain farming family tried a few years ago to destroy the Wills Gill area, a really pretty area with a stream and habitat. Luckily that didn't happen so let's hope they don't succeed this time.



# General Comments

---

**Name: Taylor Wimpey**

**Representor No: PRS05168**

Representation ID: REP07268      Question Ref: H11

Housing

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

Representation ID: REP07268      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.

---

**Name: S Whiteley**

**Representor No: PRS05176**

Representation ID: REP05760      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05760      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: M Deighton**

**Representor No: PRS05179**

Representation ID: REP05764      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05764      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: C Deighton**

**Representor No: PRS05180**

Representation ID: REP05765      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05765      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

# General Comments

---

**Name: David Wilson Homes Yorkshire West**

**Representor No: PRS05181**

Representation ID: REP05726      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

See also representation submitted for full details.

Representation ID: REP06447      Question Ref: H10      Housing

Site Plan attached to representation submitted.

Representation ID: REP07312      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.

---

**Name: Geoff Clarke**

**Representor No: PRS05182**

Representation ID: REP05766      Question Ref: H10      Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05766      Question Ref: H10      Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: D Baddeley**

**Representor No: PRS05185**

Representation ID: REP05768      Question Ref: H10      Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05768      Question Ref: H10      Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05770      Question Ref: H10      Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05770      Question Ref: H10      Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

# General Comments

---

**Name: M Haigh**

**Representor No: PRS05187**

Representation ID: REP05774      Question Ref: H10 Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05774      Question Ref: H10 Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: G Haigh**

**Representor No: PRS05188**

Representation ID: REP05776      Question Ref: H10 Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05776      Question Ref: H10 Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Freda Clarke**

**Representor No: PRS05189**

Representation ID: REP05778      Question Ref: H10 Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05778      Question Ref: H10 Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Ian Buckley**

**Representor No: PRS05191**

Representation ID: REP05777      Question Ref: H1 Housing

Although permission has been granted to site 364 this is essentially a development in a garden and contravenes the spirit of a conservation area.

Representation ID: REP05777      Question Ref: H7 Housing

I agree that the sites that have been identified as 'red' are not suitable for allocation for future housing development.

Representation ID: REP05777      Question Ref: H12 Housing

I do not think any sites being considered in this area could be suitable for gypsy and traveller site use.

Representation ID: REP05777      Question Ref: H14 Housing

I do not think that any sites being considered in this area could be suitable for use solely or in part for elderly housing accommodation.

Representation ID: REP05777      Question Ref: General comment Housing

Any development must have fully detailed plans for how infrastructure and other facilities would be developed. What about public transport? It is folly to just accept that existing road structure can absorb any further increases in traffic level. What about Headingley bottleneck?

# General Comments

---

**Name: D.j Cove**

**Representor No: PRS05192**

Representation ID: REP05782      Question Ref: General comment      Housing  
1249 -

Representation ID: REP06611      Question Ref: H12      Housing

Gypsy and traveller sites.  
The supported sites all enhance and consolidate the existing villages and none is suitable for use for this purpose.

Representation ID: REP06732      Question Ref: G7      Greenspace

Oulton & Woodlesford - See also representation submitted for full details

We have no objection to the proposed boundary amendments, but we disagree strongly with calculation used to assess our provision of Natural Greenspace.  
In the draft Core Strategy, Oulton and Woodlesford are included within the Major Settlement of Rothwell. We have argued that Oulton and Woodlesford should not be classified as part of Rothwell, but as a Smaller Settlement. They are fully comparable to other settlements with this classification e.g. Swillington. We await the opportunity to put this case to the Inspector. As a Smaller Settlement, there should be 2 ha of Natural Greenspace per 1000 people. This would require about 15 ha of Greenspace in the Forum's area.

Natural Greenspace.  
We agree that all the areas specified should be retained, enhanced and preserved for the benefit of the community.

Allotments.  
Although there calculated to be a slight overprovision of land for allotments in the Rothwell Ward, there are only a few allotments in the Forum's area, and there is a waiting list for these. We have suggested in our consideration of potential housing sites, that site #1035, off Fleet Lane would be better used for allotments.

Outdoor Sports.  
The facilities for the Rothwell Junior Football Club off Fleet Lane includes a number of pitches, one of which is a flood-lit all weather pitch.  
Woodlesford Park has a football pitch and two bowling greens, one of which is an allweather green.  
Amenity.  
The Pymonts estate (off Holmsley Lane) has a long amenity space running through it.  
Children and Young People Equipped Play.  
Woodlesford Park contains one MUGA, one children's play area and one children's skate park.

Representation ID: REP06736      Question Ref: E4      Employment

Oulton & Woodlesford See representation submitted for full details

There are no opportunities for a major employment site within the Forum's area, but the proposed mixed-use development of sites #130 and #143 would provide new employment, as would the provision of more housing for the elderly.

---

**Name: Denise Ramsden**

**Representor No: PRS05193**

Representation ID: REP05783      Question Ref: H10      Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05783      Question Ref: H10      Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.  
The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.  
Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.  
The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

# General Comments

---

**Name: John Mace**

**Representor No: PRS05196**

Representation ID: REP05784      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05784      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: D Gowson**

**Representor No: PRS05197**

Representation ID: REP05785      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05785      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Dermot Hurley**

**Representor No: PRS05198**

Representation ID: REP05786      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05786      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Sarah Holden**

**Representor No: PRS05199**

Representation ID: REP05787      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05787      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

# General Comments

---

**Name: Elizabeth Holton**

**Representor No: PRS05200**

Representation ID: REP05788      Question Ref: H7

Housing

I agree that the sites identified as 'red' are not suitable for allocation for future housing development.

Representation ID: REP05788      Question Ref: H11

Housing

What about infrastructure? The A660 is very congested, difficult to cross as either pedestrian or motorist without a detour. How will school or medical facilities cope?

Representation ID: REP05788      Question Ref: H12

Housing

I do not think that any sites being considered in this area could be suitable for gypsy and traveller site use.

Representation ID: REP05788      Question Ref: H14

Housing

I do not think that any sites being considered in this area could be suitable for use solely or in part for elderly housing accommodation.

Representation ID: REP05788      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Any development must have detailed plans for infrastructure and other facilities. It is unacceptable to say that existing road structure can cope with further increases in traffic levels.

---

**Name: West Register (property Investments) Ltd.**

**Representor No: PRS05203**

Representation ID: REP05794      Question Ref: CCR2

Retail

In response to question CCR2, West Register considers that the site would be suitable for and may be sequentially preferable for a mixed use allocation including hotel and leisure development. Such uses are appropriate in this area given its sustainable credentials, such as its proximity to the railway station, in addition to its potential to drive regeneration in the City Centre.

Representation ID: REP05794      Question Ref: General comment

Retail

Plans 2.2L, 2.3 and 2.4 are summarised in Map 22 Site Allocations Plan – Employment & Retail Sites and Map 22 Site Allocations Plan – Housing Sites. As per Plan 2.2L, both maps identify that the sites were put forward for a mixed use allocation in the Call for Sites exercise, but do not confirm whether this allocation is proposed, nor the type or level of various uses proposed.

West Register supports the allocations to the extent of outlining their extant permissions / allocations and appropriateness for employment / housing.

However, West Register objects to the apparent lack of allocation for mixed use encompassing employment, housing, leisure and active ground floor uses including retail.

Representation ID: REP05794      Question Ref: General comment

Retail

In order to not prejudice the various alternatives in the forthcoming new outline application across the Holbeck Urban Village site, the Site Allocations Plan should allow for an alternative mix of uses across the various development plots. Such flexibility would ensure that, should an application be submitted prior to the adoption of the Site Allocations Plan, the document would be consistent with such a development.

Representation ID: REP05796      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

In order to not prejudice the various alternatives in the forthcoming new outline application across the Holbeck Urban Village site, the Site Allocations Plan should allow for an alternative mix of uses across the various development plots. Such flexibility would ensure that, should an application be submitted prior to the adoption of the Site Allocations Plan, the document would be consistent with such a development.

Representation ID: REP05801      Question Ref: General comment

Employment

In order to not prejudice the various alternatives in the forthcoming new outline application across the Holbeck Urban Village site, the Site Allocations Plan should allow for an alternative mix of uses across the various development plots. Such flexibility would ensure that, should an application be submitted prior to the adoption of the Site Allocations Plan, the document would be consistent with such a development.

Representation ID: REP05801      Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Plans 2.2L, 2.3 and 2.4 are summarised in Map 22 Site Allocations Plan – Employment & Retail Sites and Map 22 Site Allocations Plan – Housing Sites. As per Plan 2.2L, both maps identify that the sites were put forward for a mixed use allocation in the Call for Sites exercise, but do not confirm whether this allocation is proposed, nor the type or level of various uses proposed.

West Register supports the allocations to the extent of outlining their extant permissions / allocations and appropriateness for employment / housing.

However, West Register objects to the apparent lack of allocation for mixed use encompassing employment, housing, leisure and active ground floor uses including retail.

# General Comments

Name: Georgia Kelly

Representor No: PRS05212

Representation ID: REP05802      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I do not want any new houses to be built in Bramhope where I live because:

Traffic road, infrastructure - the A660 road is very busy and I don't like trying to get across it with my mummy because the cars and big lorries drive very fast and are very close to me and mummy when we are stood at the roadside, and if we have to stand in the middle crossing sections I get scared. I think if more people lived in Bramhope there would be even more cars and it would be even harder to get across the road.

Accident rates on A660 – the A660 in Bramhope is at the end of my street, High Ridge Way. It is always busy. Sometimes if there is an accident at Golden Acre Park or Dynley Arm pub traffic lights, the traffic stops and queues along this road, meaning that I cannot get to where I need to travel to in my parents car, or sometimes we cannot get back home. There are always lots of sirens from mainly Ambulances and Police cars driving down this road.

Speed limit 40 mph on A660 road too high at present - I do not like walking next to the road on the side where I live, because the cars and lorries are very close to me, being only short in height it feels like they are going to run me over, especially when they are big lorries and the gust of wind they cause as they drive past makes me wobble. I can't ride my bike on the pavement on this side of the road as if I fell off it I would probably fall into the road and get squashed by a car, lorry or bus.

High Ridge Way access – it takes mummy and daddy a long time to pull out onto the main road, especially in a morning and teatime. Sometimes Mummy has to drive down towards the rugby club and then drive back up again to take us to school in Bramhope. If there were more cars using our street to get onto the main road they would be queuing up to get out. It would be too many cars trying to get out of one entrance to get onto the road - if it had to happen there must be more entrance/exit routes.

Wildlife – I am so lucky that I live in such a beautiful place. There are so many birds that I can watch in my garden and in the field behind my garden (site ref 1080) - I like to try and work out what they are called and use my Bird Watch book to help me and mummy work out what type they are. I really like the Long tailed Tits that fly through our garden in large groups, singing loudly as they go along into the next garden. I also loved the Greenfinch / Bullfinch, Fieldfare, Thrushes, Mistle Thrush, Song Thrush. I like to listen to the Great-Spotted Woodpecker knocking on the tree trunks, although I can't always see him I can definitely hear him. When I look up into the sky there is always some kind of large bird flying above my garden, mummy has told me that these are called Buzzards and Red Kites and that they use the woods that I can see to live in.

They sometimes swoop down and get little animals to eat that are in the field (1080). I once saw some Deers in the field (1080), which was really exciting. We have had a little 'lizard' animal in our garden on a number of occasions, it likes our water feature, mummy tells me that this is called a Newt. Some of the other animals that I have seen are cute little round Dormice, Red Legged Partridges (which mummy tells me fly to our garden from very far away), Pheasants, Ducks, and a large variety of Owls. I have also seen Stoats which are very cute. We have lots of Hedgehogs in our garden. Mummy found a tiny baby one last week and hid it under the bushes so that it didn't get too hot in the sun, when we went back to check on it later that night it had moved onto to another garden. Mummy tells me that sadly there are not many Hedgehogs left as too many of them don't know how to cross the roads without getting hurt. I love to see the Frogs and Toads in our gardens and street. There was a huge Toad in our street a few weeks ago and mummy had to be careful that she did not run over it in the car. On a night when the sun has gone and it is starting to get dark, I can see lots of Bats flying around our gardens and in the field (site ref 1080). This is another thing that Mummy says are protected, and we must not kill or harm them because there are not many left in the world so we must treat them like 'gold treasure', because they are priceless and once they have gone they will not come back! I hope that nobody wants to hurt all of these lovely animals which I am lucky to see and learn about. I have grown up to respect nature and want to make sure that other children can enjoy this like myself, but if this land was used to put houses on (1080) they would not have anywhere to live, and would not be able to hunt or survive. That would be really bad. If we have to preserve our protected animals NOBODY should be allowed to break those rules for the sake of making themselves lots of money. I think it is very sad when I'm being told at school that we are lucky to have such wildlife in our lovely village of Bramhope and that we must all have responsibility of looking after them, and then it could all so easily be destroyed.

Woods next to Site Ref 1080 – I have seen lots of beautiful bluebells in these woods, which is fenced off at the moment so I can't enter but I can see them and when they are flowering they look like blue carpet. Mummy says it is against the law to pick bluebells or dig them up. I will never kill a bluebell. The woods also have large birds living in them - like Buzzards and Red Kites. It has running streams which will probably also contain Newts, frogs, toads etc.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Georgia Kelly**

**Representor No: PRS05212**

A Village – I am proud to live in a village and enjoy making the yearly 'Bramhope in Bloom' posters to try and win the competition in Leeds. I don't want to see new houses being built, they would not look nice and would spoil how our village looks.

Agricultural land – Site ref 1080 and 3367A. I would like to see lots of food being grown in these, or continue to see the cows/sheep grazing in them.

Conservation – my house is in a conservation area, and we are not allowed to cut down trees and spoil how it looks, so it must stay looking nice like the other houses in the village. Why should new houses be built that could not look nice or would not look like 'old traditional' houses like mine.

Other potential new housing in Pool, Otley, Adel, Boddington Hall (Weetwood) – increased housing in these areas will also mean there is more traffic on the A660. This road is already too busy.

School – already children who live in Bramhope village are not able to get a place at the local primary school when they want one, unless they have a sibling already attending. This forthcoming academic year (Sept 13) only allowed children living within a half mile radius to successfully get a place starting at Bramhope Primary, which resulted in at least 12 children who lived in Bramhope not getting a place at Bramhope Primary that they had requested as their first choice. So that means that they will have to travel by car to a neighbouring school, again more traffic on the A660. Or they will have to travel by 'bus' although there are no other primary schools along the A660 where the bus service route is so this option of travel is highly unlikely. There simply is not the infrastructure in the village for more children with the existing primary school, this is already at critical point.

NHS facilities – There is only one GP surgery in Bramhope and it is already difficult to get to see a Doctor or Nurse. If more people lived in Bramhope and needed a Doctor I would have to wait even longer to get better when I don't feel well.

Urban Sprawl – the building of any new housing on site refs 1080 and/or 3367A would also be increasing urban sprawl within Leeds, which again would go against the whole ethos of having 'villages' in Leeds, making it look like a big messy splodge on a map!

Shops – there aren't many in Bramhope village and most of the time we have to drive to nearby places to do proper shopping.

Bus Service – this is not good, I don't like waiting for the buses because they never come on time and sometimes they don't come at all when they should, so we use our cars.

PLEASE PLEASE Leeds City Council do not destroy our green sites, and if you do they will be gone FOREVER and the animals, flowers and 'nature' would not return to these areas.

PLEASE PLEASE use other sites that don't have as much nature living there, or depending on it to survive their existence and future. Use those sites that are called 'brown field sites'.

Building new homes in site ref nos 1080 and / or 3367A would be a big big mistake and horrible. It would make me very sad.



# General Comments

---

**Name: Dennis Skinner**

**Representor No: PRS05215**

Representation ID: REP05805      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Hx

I wish to register my objection to the Housing Site Allocations for the Leeds Outer North East region in respect of the allocations for the Thorpe Arch site (1055) and for all village sites to have been "sieved out".

My objection is based on several points:

1. Site 1055 will not provide the volume of additional houses needed within the 15 year planning period. At a reasonable predicted build-rate it would probably take over 30 years to deliver the suggested target.
2. The site is not sustainable at the high number of houses suggested.
3. The site will not provide the breadth of house types required to enhance the growth of the LCC area as a place for business and to attract people in high-level roles in commerce and industry.
4. Sieving out all the "village" sites in favour of this large site will create a blight on those villages and will prevent small beneficial developments in these places.
5. Site 1300 (Linton Lane, Linton, Wetherby Golf Club) should be allocated as 'Green' to allow the small number of appropriate houses in that location. The recent Residents' Survey identified a need for more 4/5 bedroomed houses. It is unacceptable that the residents should now support LCC's initial view that there should be NO development in the village. Site 1300 meets the identified housing need of residents and will secure much needed sports and social facilities and the long-term financial future of the golf club (the largest land-owner and employer in the village).

---

**Name: Michael, Eleanor Shorto**

**Representor No: PRS05216**

Representation ID: REP05806      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Just a comment that the general public would appear to have been overlooked in this consultation process; generally in this area we seem to have become aware of the site allocation plans in a very haphazard and "by chance" manner, very late on.

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Laura Fosker

**Representor No:** PRS05218

Representation ID: REP05808      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing to register my concerns about the currently proposed housing development sites in Calverley. Calverley is very unique in that it is a lovely local community with good schools, which has the benefits of being within easy distance of Leeds Centre, but still has beautiful untouched green space, some of which is wild woodland and other parts farmed. The more of this that is lost, the less special Calverley becomes. Furthermore, the major downside to Calverley of course is the traffic, and any new development can only contribute to this. I am pleased to see that 1193B, 1123B, and 1117 have been listed as not suitable for development. These are all areas where at the weekend local families can be seen walking, cycling, running, looking at the farm life, and enjoying being outdoors at all times of year. It would be tragic to lose any of this green space, and particularly area 1117 would be devastating. This is a beautiful area where our family have spent a lot of time, and there are always others out enjoying the green space as well. In general I oppose any developments in Calverley, even on the sites declared 'green', as anyone who lives locally would tell you that our local traffic around rush hour is approaching untenable. It is not uncommon for traffic to back up all the way through the village from the Greengates traffic lights at one end, and the ringroad at the other. When this happens, the backroads of Calverley are used for 'cutting through' by residents and commuters alike. This makes them dangerously busy for such small roads on which children are often out playing or walking to and from school. The council themselves must recognise this, hence the welcome introduction of new speed restrictions very recently in the small roads of the village. Further development can only ever add to this traffic problem. In summary I oppose all the of the proposed housing development sites because of loss of greenspace for the local community, and traffic impact. Calverley is a thriving community, and increased development can only stifle it.

---

**Name:** Elizabeth Hamblin

**Representor No:** PRS05222

Representation ID: REP05814      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing to object to the proposed building of large numbers of new houses in the Rawdon area. I understand there are proposals for 350 houses on the fields around Warm Lane opposite Little London. As a resident of Little London I am objecting for several reasons. The loss of green belt is something that would negatively affect our lives. We frequently enjoy these areas for walks and outings and this was one of the main reasons we chose to live where we do. We would be devastated to lose the close proximity of beautiful green belt close to our house and feel that other Brown field sites and urban regeneration need to be considered first rather than taking the easy option of putting houses in greenbelt land. As well as the consideration of the greenbelt itself is the conservation area that they would all be adjacent to. This is a historic area which is rightly a conservation area and I feel additional close housing would adversely affect the area.

>

> I would also strongly object due to the the nature of traffic around this area. I travel down the A658 every day to work in Ecclehill and the traffic is already incredibly congested. In a morning the traffic is solid from Greengates crossroads to past the little london area where I attempt to pull out. THe addition of feasibly 500 cars (assuming a large number of residents will have 2 cars) would be horrendous and dangerous. In addition to the traffic issue is the effect on local services including schools which i understand are already at capacity.

# General Comments

**Name:** Emma Chetham

**Representor No:** PRS05226

Representation ID: REP06591      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing to you to protest against the Leeds Site Allocation Plan, especially that proposals that will affect Rawdon. I was particularly unhappy that most of my neighbours were not aware that the process was even underway, there was little or no publicity in Rawdon from the Council on the proposal. The Leeds Council site allocation website was difficult to navigate and use and did not appear to be designed to make it easy for people to understand the proposals. There was also no briefing session in Rawdon and the session in Horsforth school was neither well-advertised or well-signposted. This makes me suspicious that there was a conscious Council policy not to advertise the site allocation proposals in this area.

I disagree with the site allocation plans for Rawdon, especially on those relating to 4095 New York Lane, 3331 Knott Lane and 3329 Layton Lane on the following points:

These sites are green belt and therefore should not be first on the list to be developed as green belt cannot be reclaimed once it is used for building. The Housing Minister has recently said that green belt should only be built on in exceptional circumstances.

Green belt has positive implications for the community's well being, lowering stress, increasing fitness, providing an area for recreation, lowering levels of pollution, being a habitat for wildlife (bats, owls, woodpeckers, birds of prey being regularly seen in the area) and adding to the character of the area.

The implications for traffic - the developments would significantly increase the traffic load for Rawdon and Horsforth, with increases in pollution and congestion.

This development will add to urban sprawl and the definition between Horsforth and Rawdon will be lost.

The large number of houses planned for this small area will have a negative impact on the local infrastructure, putting school places, jobs and healthcare under unsustainable pressure.

The large amount of building on the fields will cause drainage problems and increase water run off and add to flooding issues.

An increase in light pollution

Layton Lane will become a more heavily used road, it is badly maintained at present, and is a hazard for children and adults at the front of the properties due to the speed of traffic currently using it.

This increased traffic will no doubt also increase road traffic accidents on Layton Lane and surrounding areas such as Bayton Lane which already are accident black spots.

Old maps show that it has been subject to mining in the past and not only does this constitute a concern to future development but also the investigation into/disturbance of these workings is a threat to the homes of current residents.

Other brownfield sites near the area such as Kirstall Forge and Woodside Quarry are not being developed at present, they should be developed before moving onto green belt.

Representation ID: REP07088      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing to you to protest against the Leeds Site Allocation Plan, especially that proposals that will affect Rawdon.

I was particularly unhappy that most of my neighbours were not aware that the process was even underway, there was little or no publicity in Rawdon from the Council on the proposal.

The Leeds Council site allocation website was difficult to navigate and use and did not appear to be designed to make it easy for people to understand the proposals. There was also no briefing session in Rawdon and the session in Horsforth school was neither well-advertised or well-signposted.

This makes me suspicious that there was a conscious Council policy not to advertise the site allocation proposals in this area.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Steve Matthews**

**Representor No: PRS05229**

Representation ID: REP05821      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal of the multiple new housing schemes in and around the Warm Lane/A658/Little London area.

Traffic is daily backed up from the B6152 traffic lights right back to the JCT 600 roundabout. Egress and entry from my street, Mawcroft Close, is virtually impossible now. If all these proposed houses go ahead this road will grind to a complete standstill.

No account has been taken of the huge influx of NHS employees at Rawdon House and Fulford Grange on the B6152 and the huge number of vehicles they have introduced to the area.

The A 65 is already acknowledged to be at saturation point and these proposals will simply cause a heavily congested road to gridlock, outside a junior school with all the dangers that clearly attracts.

This small area is the crossroads for huge commuter movements to Bradford and Leeds and no proposed minor tinkering to the current road network can hope to alleviate the present level of traffic, let alone the amount that will be generated by the new houses being proposed.

The lives of all the present residents will be adversely affected. The environment will be indisputably destroyed. No words or platitudes can alter the fact that green fields will be turned into estates.

My understanding is the schools are hard pressed as it is and the natural influx of all these families will simply overburden the existing services.

The damage done by the Green Lane development is more than detrimental, if anyone actually cares to look, go any weekday and see the free flow of traffic is squeezed to a stop by the NHS staff parking all along Green Lane and beyond the Fire Station. Houses built in the old Mill site will have hugely restricted access and the problems are clear.

To multiply this by carrying on across the roundabout and along Apperley Lane is to simply compound the problem exponentially and anyone who refuses to acknowledge this is simply being wilfully blind to the blatant truth.

Once I again I strongly urge you to reconsider and reject this proposal

---

**Name: Linda Green**

**Representor No: PRS05244**

Representation ID: REP07358      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Site 1171B - Green to Red (Assumed)

We, the residents of Ashfield, LS12 6JX, object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed housing development on site 1171b. Our objections are as follows-

1. PRIVACY- The residents of Ashfield treasure privacy and enjoy their gardens immensely, the building of large 3 story houses on all sides will completely destroy said privacy.

2. TRAFFIC- The traffic flow would be increased significantly on an already extremely busy road (a58 Whitehall road) leading to an likely increase in accidents and general traffic disruption and congestion.

3. POLLUTION - The land on which the new development is proposed to be built is a former landfill site, any building work undertaken on this site could unleash hazardous pollution (asbestos, chemicals etc).

4. DANGEROUS GROUND-There are a series of mineshafts running beneath 1171b which were formerly used by Famley Fireclay brickworks, which was situated opposite Ashfield. Again, this will pose a danger to any new buildings situated on the site.

5. STANDARD OF LIVING - In the fast 20 years we (the residents of Ashfield) have seen huge developments opposite (Lettershop Group) and adjacent (new housing). These developments have been depressing enough but fields to the back and one side of our houses remain development free and provide a sense of openness and countryside, these proposed developments will take these final two pieces of greenbelt away, leaving our houses completely surrounded by ugly storage units and even uglier housing.

6. ELECTRICITY PYLON- There is currently a large electricity pylon situated on 1171b, is building houses so close to such a construction safe?

7. DRAINAGE AND FLOODING - During wet weather a huge amount of water runs down from the hills on which the proposed housing will be built, a series of flood banks have been built into the land behind our houses to stop our properties becoming flooded. We do not wish to become the victims of flooding for the sake of a housing developers greed.

8. CHARAOER-Our properties pre date the vast majority of other housing in the area and have a certain amount of historical charm, being surrounded by a "housing estate" of modern identikit homes will destroy this character

9. GREEN BELT -In an age of ecological awareness is it really necessary to destroy such a huge area of green belt when an existing area of newly cleared brown belt is available only Y, a mile away? (the site of the former Roda industrial works on adjacent to Ringways car dealership)

10. This land needs to remain in the green belt, continuing housing along up Whitehall Road would just make a countryside area into one of urban sprawl.

---

**Name: C Robinson**

**Representor No: PRS05247**

Representation ID: REP05842      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I have read in the Morley Observer that there are plans to build up to 8,000 new homes in the Gelderd Road area of Morley, on green belt land.

Morley has little enough green bely land left, the roads are already very busy, at all hours of the day & night, there is a lack of public transport, school places, Doctors, Dentists, Police, Fire Service, etc. The car parks in Morley are often full, people park their cars in the town, then travel to Leeds to work by bus, as Morley station is outlying, & has a lack of car parking, plus the area is likely to be built on. I have lived in Morley most of my life, & have seen the green/open spaces disappear to be taken over by housing estates, trading estates. A lot of the trading estates have vacant offices & units; are any more required? The mills of Morley have been converted into flats, that are often empty, to let or for sale. Thanks

# General Comments

---

**Name: Christine E Anderson**

**Representor No: PRS05274**

Representation ID: REP05874      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Alternatively, consideration be given to putting a similarly sized development (100 to 150 houses) between Pool village and Arthington. This would be on the basis that the Arthington train station is re-opened and an off road path / cycleway is provided between Pool and Arthington and a similar access from Bramhope considered. This later suggestion would provide a valuable amenity for the whole area, enable some development to take place and link the two villages in a environmentally friendly way.

---

**Name: Michael Anderson**

**Representor No: PRS05288**

Representation ID: REP05886      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Alternatively, consideration be given to putting a similarly sized development (100 to 150 houses) in an appropriate area between Pool village and Arthington. This would be on the basis that the Arthington train station is re-opened and an off road path / cycleway is provided between Pool and Arthington and a similar access from Bramhope considered. This later suggestion would provide a valuable amenity for the whole area, enable some development to take place and link the two / three villages in a environmentally friendly way.

---

**Name: Alex Priestley**

**Representor No: PRS05289**

Representation ID: REP00532      Question Ref: H1

Housing

xxx

Representation ID: REP05885      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Dear Sir or Madam,

I would like to object to the council's designation of the site 1199 (land off Moseley Wood Gardens) as Green for the following reasons:

1. Access

The proposed access to the housing development for Moseley Bottom would be along narrow roads already choked with parked cars making them effectively single track. 200 houses would result in at least 200 extra car trips per day making an already sub-optimal traffic situation worse.

2. Public transport provision

Due to the nature of the roads discussed above, I find it unlikely that there will be sufficient public transport provision included in the development.

3. Local facilities and schools

There are already issues with oversubscription at local schools. Adding a further burden to this without the provision of extra capacity will cause the current situation to be worse. There are also no medical facilities within easy reach, and those that are nearest are oversubscribed.

4. Flooding

Network Rail already suffer issues with flooding on the railway line between Horsforth station and Bramhope tunnel. Building on this greenfield site will further exacerbate the problem as it is the only bit of land available for rainwater to percolate into the ground between most of the Cookridge area and Moseley Beck. A housing development on this site would result in much larger amounts of run-off reaching the beck in a shorter amount of time. Since most climate scientists in the UK agree that rainfall is going to become less frequent but heavier, resulting in more flash flooding, the council should be trying to increase the built environment's capacity to cope with severe weather events, rather than reducing it. Building on this land would mean Moseley Beck and the infrastructure along the valley would be likely to suffer more severe flooding more often.

5. Ecology

The land along Moseley Beck provides an important 'wildlidfe corridor' between the open countryside further out of Leeds towards Otley and Bramhope and the important woodland habitats further into Leeds such as Woodside Quarry, Hawksworth Woods etc. Developing this land would cut off this corridor.

Also, the land itself provides an important habitat for a large variety of wildlife.

6. Sustainability

Building on greenfield sites does not fit in with the council's sustainability targets. Building on brownfield sites should be prioritised in every case.

I would suggest that this site is put back as a PAS in the development plan

# General Comments

Name: Alec Colgan

Representor No: PRS05294

Representation ID: REP05896 Question Ref: H10

Housing

Land at Farfield House, Wetherby Road, Bramham was submitted to the 2012 Call for Sites but, for reasons unknown, was not assessed or included as part of the 2012 SHLAA or the current Site Allocation Issues and Options consultation. Attached at Appendix A is a plan indicating the extent of the Land at Farfield House in Bramham. It currently comprises one existing residential unit with planning consent for a further dwelling through the conversion of a barn and outbuildings. The land is available for development; with willing landowners. It extends to around 0.45ha of developable land. Farfield House, is surrounded on three sides by built development and major infrastructure and to all intents and purposes is a developed site within the village envelope. On two sides (south and east) there is modern housing development. To the west, the A1 was recently (in the last decade) upgraded to motorway standard including the provision of a new local bridleway (Non Motorised User route) alongside the property. Recent planning permissions for the conversion of outbuildings to residential use would support the view that it is a suitable site for development. An indicative housing layout is included at Appendix B which indicates that the site is capable of accommodating sixteen dwelling units. This proposes eight two-bedroomed flats/apartments, along with eight three- and four-bedroomed detached dwellings. Such a mix reflects a market appraisal of the site. Consequently the Farfield House site is suitable. Having considered the site with the components of Policy SP6 we are of the view that the allocation of the site for housing is consistent with the broad aims of the policy and that the site does not perform a Green Belt function, or contribute to the openness of the Green Belt. There is no need therefore for its retention in the Green Belt. Bramham is a sustainable location. The site is promoted by willing owners and is suitable, achievable and deliverable. On the basis of this material we consider that this site should be graded GREEN. In coming to this view we are conscious of the considerations set out in Policy SP6 as outlined in the introductory Chapter to this representation. Dealing with those provisions in turn, we would suggest:

## i) Sustainability

Bramham is identified as a Smaller Settlement. It is served by a Primary School (in the adjacent Parish), a village shop, village hall, a sports field and pavilion along with a couple of public houses. There are regular and frequent bus services to Wetherby and Leeds City Centre.

## ii) Brownfield preference

There is an existing dwelling and planning permission to convert barns and outbuildings to a dwelling. There are areas of hardstanding along with various other storage and agricultural buildings. The site can therefore be classed as previously developed and brownfield. Residual areas comprise of lawn and a vegetable plot with orchard.

## iii) Green Belt Purposes

It is worth noting that the NPPF at Section 9 sets out the Government's position on Green Belts attaching great importance to them. Para 79 suggests that "the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence". In contrast Para 85 suggests (point 2) that Green Belts should not "include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open". Within the same paragraph the final point suggests that boundaries should be clearly defined using recognisable features which are likely to be permanent. To explain the position at Farfield House, it is surrounded on three sides by built development and major infrastructure and to all intents and purposes is a developed site within the village envelope. On two sides (south and east) there is modern housing development. To the west, the A1 was recently upgraded to motorway standard including the provision of a new local bridleway alongside the property. Recent planning permissions for the conversion of outbuildings to residential use would support the view that it is a suitable site for development.

Given these changes in circumstance it is difficult to consider how the site contributes to the general characteristics and openness of the Green Belt in the same way as the agricultural fields to the north do, or for that matter reflects the purposes for keeping land in the Green Belt. On this basis we consider that the house and gardens should be removed from the Green Belt with the boundary realigned along the northern boundary as indicated on the attached plan which is marked by an established and mature hedgeline. This is considered to be a common sense approach.

## iv) Distinctiveness

Farfield House adjoins modern housing to the south and east comprising a mixture of brick, limestone and render to the east and is bounded to the west by infrastructure associated with the A1 Motorway and provision for non-motorised users. Farfield House itself, although of limestone construction, is of little architectural merit or distinctiveness. A site layout included at Appendix B for 16 dwelling units, demonstrates how the site can come forward to provide a mix of housing types which are suitable for the site and reflect market advice from local estate agents.

## v) Lead in times and Construction

The site is available and can come forward within two years subject to the planning process.

## vi) Greenspace

Retention of the landscape buffer to the west will maintain a green edge to the site.

## vii) Flood Risk

The site is not within a flood risk zone as defined on the Environment Agency map. In setting out these comments it is recognised that there is a need to undertake further professional and technical studies. Further discussion with the Council is welcomed for bringing this site forward, including the preparation of additional technical and feasibility reports (for example, topography, drainage, ecology, arboricultural and noise surveys) as the Council may require over the coming months. On the basis of the above we consider that the site is available, suitable and achievable and should therefore be categorised as GREEN.

Representation ID: REP05896 Question Ref: H11

Housing

We do not consider that housing sites should be phased over particular periods of the Core Strategy as this is a matter for the market to determine.

We would consider that land at Farfield House could come forward immediately subject to relevant permission. Bramham is a strong housing market area and the proposals reflect market advice.

# General Comments

**Name:** Alec Colgan  
**Representor No:** PRS05294

Representation ID: REP05896      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Within the Submitted Core Strategy, the Spatial Development Strategy (Spatial Policy 1 and Table 1) suggests that Wetherby is the principal settlement in the Outer North East. Bardsey, Barwick-in-Elmet, Boston Spa, Bramham, Collingham and Scholes are all identified as Smaller Settlements. There is a distinction within the Smaller Settlements with Boston Spa and Collingham identified as Local Centres offering a range of shops and other local facilities, with the consequence they are able to accommodate more development than the other settlements such as Bramham. Giving consideration to Table 2, this indicates the broad distribution between the levels of the settlement hierarchy. Extrapolating for the Outer North East, this suggests suggesting that 60% of the requirement should be around the major settlements 32% around the Smaller Settlements and the remaining 8% in Other Rural. Within the Outer North East, the situation is somewhat complicated by constraints around Wetherby and the presence of the Thorp Arch Trading Estate. There is inherent support within the Core Strategy for the redevelopment of the Trading Estate site which offers in part a major brownfield opportunity. Landowners Rockspring Hanover Property Unit Trust has submitted an outline planning application for the site (13/03134/OT) which proposes some 2,000 residential units, along with highway and other infrastructure. Whilst the application remains to be determined, it is a consideration which proposes an ambitious delivery of 135 dwelling units per year. Taking these considerations into account, we are of the view that the Council should be seeking to identify sufficient land around Bramham to accommodate additional dwellings for the Core Strategy period and beyond.

# General Comments

**Name: Gladedale Developments**

**Representor No: PRS05299**

Representation ID: REP05892      Question Ref: H10

Housing

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.

Land located within the grounds of the former High Royds Hospital, Menston as highlighted on plan reference 3283-SK-02, should be subject of a formal housing allocation within the Site Allocations Plan. For the reasons highlighted below, and in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF it is fully deliverable in that it is available now, offers a suitable location for development and is achievable with a realistic prospect that any housing can be delivered on the site within 5 years and that development of the site is viable.

## i.Availability

The land is owned, in its entirety, by Gladedale Estates Ltd. These representations are submitted, under instruction from Gladedale Estates Ltd, on the basis that they intend to bring the site forward for development as soon as possible.

## ii.Suitability

In order to meet the Core Strategy housing target of 66,000 dwellings for Leeds up to 2028 Core Strategy SP10 confirms that selective Green Belt release is required in order to assist in meeting the scale of the housing target required. In light of this, a Green Belt Review Assessment has been carried out which has assessed sites against the 5 principal purposes of Green Belt, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. However, whilst land to the south of the site the subject of these representations was assessed, this particular site has been excluded from any assessment and, therefore, excluded from any possibility of being subject to a housing allocation.

It is Gladedale's view that the site is suitable to accommodate a low density executive housing scheme with a potential yield of circa 15 dwellings due to the fact that development on the site does not compromise any of the five principal aims of Green Belt. In order to demonstrate that this is the case we have applied the Green Belt Review methodology used by the Council in assessing other potential Green Belt sites to this site (contained in Site Allocations Plan Volume 1, Appendix 1), as highlighted below:

### 1.Check the Unrestricted Sprawl of Large Built Up Areas

i.Development of the site would not lead to/constitute ribbon development;

ii.Development of the site would not result in an isolated development not connected to existing boundaries;

iii.The site is well connected to the built-up area, although only one boundary adjoins existing development;

iv.Development of the site would effectively 'round off' existing development within the grounds of the former High Royds Hospital site;

v.Existing mature trees provide an effective existing barrier between the site and undeveloped land to the south providing a strong defensible barrier to any further development southwards.

### 2.Prevent Neighbouring Towns from Merging

i.As highlighted in v. above existing mature trees provide an effective physical barrier/boundary to the site that would ensure that development was well contained;

ii.Development of the site would not lead to the physical connection of any settlements.

### 3.Assist in Safeguarding the Countryside from Encroachment

i.There is no strong, defensible boundary between existing development to the north and the site;

ii.The site is privately owned although there is a bridleway along its southern extent;

iii.The site is not subject to a national or local nature conservation designation;

iv.The site does not contain any areas of woodland, trees or hedgerow that are protected and those significant trees that are unprotected will be retained;

v.The site is low grade agricultural land;

vi.The site does not contain any buildings.

### 4.Preserve the Setting and Special Character of Historic Towns

i.Whilst the site is located within the former High Royds Hospital grounds (which is Grade II listed) it does not sit adjacent to either a conservation area or the former listed hospital itself or within its setting.

### 5.Assist in Urban Regeneration, by Encouraging the Recycling of Derelict and other Urban Land.

Not applicable.

## iii.Achievability

Gladedale can confirm that, first, the site is immediately available and, secondly, can confirm the site's economic viability taking into consideration all known costs and likely achievable values of housing at the upper end of the market within the Aireborough Housing Market Area.



## General Comments

---

**Name: Gladedale Developments**

**Representor No: PRS05299**

In light of the fact that the site performs very well when assessed in the context of the Council's Green Belt Review Assessment together with the fact that the site is fully deliverable, it is Gladedale's view that the land defined in plan reference 3283-SK-02 should be allocated for an executive housing scheme with an indicative yield of 15 dwellings.

---

Representation ID: REP06000      Question Ref: H7

Housing

### 5.0 Conclusion

5.1 The purpose of this submission is to promote the full site area for a housing allocation i.e. 1200A and 1200B combined. In that context:

- Site 1200A (Question H1) we agree this site should be allocated (green) for housing and;
- Site 1200B (Questions H7 and H8) we do not agree that this site should be identified as unsuitable (red) for housing and should be allocated (green) in conjunction with 1200A for the reasons already set out in the detail of this report and summarised here.

5.2 The comprehensive site (1200A & 1200B) is considered to be well located to the settlement of Gildersome for it to be considered as a housing allocation. Together 1200A & 1200B are considered to form a coherent parcel of land amounting to circa 4.9ha which can make a valuable contribution to the housing land requirement of the Outer South West within a sustainable location and recognised as a smaller settlement in the Settlement Hierarchy set out in the draft Core Strategy.

5.3 The residual target for the Outer South West is  $7,200 - 1614 = 5586$  units that still need to be sought from the pool of SHLAA sites. Fifty (50) sites are identified as "green" in the Site Allocations DPD, 26% of these are in the Green Belt. Furthermore, of the 31 "amber" sites identified 19 of these are within designated Green Belt. As such, it is clear that the Council will have to release land from the Green Belt to deliver housing growth in line with the draft Core Strategy and Draft Site Allocations DPD targets and this site represents a good opportunity to meet those requirements in a less sensitive green belt location.

5.4 The site's (1200A & 1200B) retention as Green Belt is not essential in terms of Green Belt objectives because development of the site would constitute some rounding off of the settlement and the opportunity to create a long term defensible boundary, particularly through the strengthening of the general tree lined boundaries to the eastern side of the site within the current ownership. No encroachment into the countryside would be possible and there would be no potential for the coalescence of settlements. It would represent a logical extension to 'Smaller Settlement' in the Leeds settlement hierarchy.

---

**Name: Amy Law**

**Representor No: PRS05302**

---

Representation ID: REP05900      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Alternatively, consideration be given to putting a similarly sized development (100 to 150 houses) between Pool village and Arthington. This would be on the basis that the Arthington train station is re-opened and an off road path / cycleway is provided between Pool and Arthington and a similar access from Bramhope considered. This later suggestion would provide a valuable amenity for the whole area, enable some development to take place and link the two villages in a environmentally friendly way.

---

**Name: Kathrine Gray**

**Representor No: PRS05311**

---

Representation ID: REP05908      Question Ref: H11

Housing

We do not consider that housing sites should be phased over particular periods of the Core Strategy as this is a matter for the market to determine. We would consider that land at Haw Lane Yeadon could come forward immediately subject to relevant permission. Yeadon is a strong housing market area and the proposals reflect market advice. We understand that there is strong demand for new homes in Yeadon, and a shortage of land to provide them.

---

Representation ID: REP05908      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Within the Submitted Core Strategy, the Spatial Development Strategy (Spatial Policy 1 and Table 1) suggests that in Aireborough the contiguous urban areas of Guiseley/Yeadon and Rawdon will be the main focus of residential development. Spatial Policy 6 sets out the District Housing Requirement for the Plan period and assumes that a proportion of housing units will come forward on small and unidentified sites (i.e. windfalls) but that the majority of units will be provided on sites which will emerge through the allocation process based in part on their consistency with a number of considerations.

The City Council has suggested that sufficient land should be identified in Aireborough to accommodate around 1550 units (Table 3); a figure which should be regarded as a minimum contrary to the statement at para 1.3.6 of this consultation document. There is also a need to define further areas of safeguarded land (Protected Areas of Search) for removal from the Green Belt to accommodate longer term growth. Giving consideration to Table 2, this indicates the broad distribution between the levels of the settlement hierarchy. However, given the nature of the Aireborough Housing Market Character Area would suggest all of the provision should be accommodated around the main area.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Richard Nicholson**

**Representor No: PRS05313**

Representation ID: REP05910      Question Ref: H4

Housing

I strongly object to the proposed development of 185 houses on Newlathes Fields.

The points I would like to raise are:

1. Child Safety – The sheer number of additional vehicles on the roads (easily 2 per household = circa 370) near Newlathes School would present a significantly increased risk to pupils and also children out of school hours.
2. Roads – All the roads leading to Newlathes are extremely narrow. Having recently moved to Victoria Close, it has taken me and my wife a while to get used to this especially as many cars are parked on the road, adding another 370 vehicles to this road network does not make sense.
3. Services – I understand that there are no proposals for additional services such as doctors or schools. Again, having moved to the Horsforth area 6 months ago, it is obvious that the local surgery (Fieldhead) is already over capacity and to add circa 700 people would have a negative impact on the access and quality of care available to the current and proposed residents of the Victorias/Newlathes.
4. Quality of Life – I looked at the fields and imagined what the development would look like. The thoughts that came to me were “where would my children play with their friends?”, “where would I walk my dog?”, “where would my elderly neighbours walk to when they want some fresh air and scenery?”

Thank you for taking the time to read this email, should any points I have made require any clarification, please contact on the numbers below. I would be grateful if you can keep informed of any developments regarding the proposed development.

---

**Name: M Tojagic**

**Representor No: PRS05349**

Representation ID: REP05958      Question Ref: G10

Greenspace

Allotments off Gledhow Valley Road, Chapel Allerton

4.0 WHY THE REMOVAL OF THE PREVIOUS ALLOCATION OF PART OF SHLAA SITE 1019 AS ALLOTMENTS, SHOULD BE SUPPORTED.

4.1 This representation supports the proposal at G10 of Leeds Site Allocations Plan, Volume 2-- - 5 North. This states;

“G10 – Part of the existing UDP N1A (allotments) designation at land off Gledhow Valley Road Chapel Allerton has been put forward as a possible housing site (site ref. 1019). It was not identified as in a greenspace use in the Open Space Audit therefore it is proposed to amend the boundary of the allocation to exclude this land. Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace...or released for housing?”

4.2 The representation site is in private ownership with no public access to it and has never been in use as allotments or any other greenspace use.

4.3 The submitters have consistently advised the local planning authority that the existing UDPR designation was erroneous. The allotments are further north along Gledhow Valley Road close to its junction with Harrogate Road. As no part of the representation site has been used as allotments, this is assumed to be a drafting error to be properly corrected as part of the preparation of the LDF.

4.4 Therefore site should not be allocated as greenspace or allotments. Accordingly, the submitters agree with the proposal to amend the boundary of the greenspace allocation to exclude the site. The site clearly fails the criteria for greenspace allocation as set out in the RUDP and specifically, as no part of the site has ever been in allotment use or serves a greenspace function, it is requested that this designation is removed as part of the production of the forthcoming Site Allocations Plan.

Full submission is saved under REP05958 with more details on housing comments

# General Comments

---

**Name: Richter**

**Representor No: PRS05352**

Representation ID: REP05951      Question Ref: H1

Housing

The City Council has identified a number of Green Belt sites as "Green", as well as other sites which are within the Other Rural. Where this approach is broadly agreed, however, this merely reinforces the earlier comments that the Council's process is flawed, and the consideration of sites is inconsistent.

Representation ID: REP05951      Question Ref: H11

Housing

In general we do not consider that housing sites should be phased over particular periods of the Core Strategy, as this is a matter for the market to determine.

Scarcroft is a strong housing market area. Government guidance is clear that the focus of the planning system should be to significantly boost housing delivery to support economic growth and address issues of affordability. We would consider that this site could come forward immediately, without detriment to the Core Strategy and the spatial development strategy within it.

Representation ID: REP05951      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Within the Submitted Core Strategy, the Spatial Development Strategy (Spatial Policy 1 and Table 1) suggests that Wetherby is the principal settlement in the Outer North East. Bardsey, Barwick-in-Elmet, Boston Spa, Bramham, Collingham and Scholes are all identified as Smaller Settlements. There is a distinction within the Smaller Settlements with Boston Spa and Collingham identified as Local Centres offering a range of shops and other local facilities, with the consequence they are able to accommodate more development. Outside of this defined Settlement hierarchy the remainder of the Outer North East falls within the Villages and Rural; this includes the village of Scarcroft.

SP1 suggests that Wetherby is the principal settlement in the Outer North East. Bardsey, Barwick-in-Elmet, Boston Spa, Bramham, Collingham and Scholes are all identified as Smaller Settlements. There is a distinction within the Smaller Settlements with Boston Spa and Collingham identified as Local Centres offering a range of shops and other local facilities, with the consequence they are able to accommodate more development.

Giving consideration to Table 2, this indicates the broad distribution between the levels of the settlement hierarchy. Extrapolating for the Outer North East, this suggests that 60% of the requirement should be around the major settlements 32% around the Smaller Settlements and the remaining 8% in Other Rural, including Scarcroft. With the draft Site Allocations the City Council has gone through a process of assessing land against the settlement hierarchy (SP1) but then "sieved out" sites (such as SHLAA site 1041) which it regards do not comply with the identified settlements in that hierarchy. This would be contrary to Policy SP6 which suggests that a proportion of housing will be delivered in the Other Rural category; it expects that 50% of that housing will be on infill sites and 50% as extensions to villages. For the District this implies that 2% of the 70,000 or so houses to be built (i.e. 1,400 units) will be built in the Other Rural areas. This can be extrapolated to the Outer North East to be around 400 units. It is not appropriate that the Council has simply sieved out these sites; the approach is flawed and therefore unsound. Given that Policy SP6 suggests that up to 400 dwellings could be provided on such sites in the Outer North East as infill sites or as extensions the approach is flawed and therefore unsound. To be consistent the Council must revisit the process and consider the sites which fall within the Others Rural, in the same fashion as those which have been subject to the Council's appraisal process.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Richard Davies**

**Representor No: PRS05357**

Representation ID: REP05954      Question Ref: H10

Housing

I believe that there are also a significant number of existing domestic properties or buildings/sites suitable for residential use that are not being currently used. To cite a few examples near my house:

- one whole side of Crow Lane (adjacent to the petrol station) where Tates restored several properties several years and have simply left them vacant. There is another one awaiting restoration as well as an old workshop that could be built on there too.
- opposite this there is the old gas works which could be built on after remediation.
- there is a further plot of land between Cambridge Street and Crow Lane that could be used to build houses.
- LCC owns a range of old buildings on Wesley Street behind the Courthouse which could be restored and converted into flats/houses.
- the scrapyard on Burras Lane behind the parish church would better suit housing.
- the former photocopy shop on Bondgate.
- the undeveloped and derelict Summer Cross pub on East Busk Lane (which I would rather see as a pub again)

There are also a number of empty or under-utilised floors above a range of shops and premises in the centre of Otley which could be brought into use or redesignated as residential. If this were coupled with a better identification of vacant brownfield sites around the town, I believe this would more than meet demand.

Representation ID: REP05954      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Site 745

- 745 (rear of Cambridge estate) - although this is presented for information, I would strongly object to this site ever being developed due to size and remoteness from amenities. This would fundamentally and irreparably change the character of the town and turn it into a car-based community rather than the significantly pedestrian one we now have.

I have tried to send you feedback via the official pages, but the link crashed as I was completing this yesterday and the site has proved unable to perform its job since. I would, however, like to offer you feedback on the site allocations plan and plans for Otley. Overall, this is an important exercise and I appreciate the work put in so far. On the whole though I do not think this offers the right options for Otley for two main reasons. Firstly, I do not think there is a proven demand for large numbers of new build housing in Otley. We have a major development being built at Garnetts Mill and I think this should be the only major development for the next few years. The demand for resulting from this can be measured alongside the impact on the creaking road and public transport infrastructure which inhibits growth. In light of the above and the peculiar character of Otley, I think the Council needs to undertake a proper review of empty or under-utilised buildings and what space is available for development rather than blithely assuming that new build is the answer. Large-scale new build might make life easier for developers, but this isn't necessarily right for us given that there are alternatives.

As part of this, I would suggest that the town centre is rezoned so that the commercial properties are concentrated in a smaller area and former commercial properties are converted into housing, such that all commercial properties in the centre are occupied. This is already happening in a haphazard way as seen in the recent loss of two shops on Gay Lane (newspaper shop and barbers), the old shop on the corner of Orchard St/Cambridge St, and the electrical repair shop on Walkergate. This formal approach could have the combined effect of freeing up premises for housing and making the commercial centre more vibrant.

I would be very happy to get involved in further deliberations and to show you around some of the places I have discussed here. I would implore you though to consider an alternative approach to Otley which moves away from a simplistic view that large-scale new build is the answer for our small town. There is scope for development, but it can be found in better using the existing buildings and sites we have.

Please confirm that you have received this message and that this will be added to the consultation.

---

**Name: Philip Holden**

**Representor No: PRS05363**

Representation ID: REP05959      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05959      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

# General Comments

**Name: Foxlow Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS05364**

Representation ID: REP05961      Question Ref: H3

Housing

In respect of land north of Woodland Drive Thorp Arch. This is a new site which is being promoted expressly for the purposes of providing affordable housing. A plan at Appendix A indicates the extent of the site boundaries. The site extends to 12.0 has (29.6 acres).

There are fundamental concerns in relation to the Council's approach to site selection in the Issues and Options document for the Other Rural sites. In effect they are removing a number of sites through a sieving process which excludes sites which are not adjoining or within the settlement hierarchy.

Given that Policy SP6 suggests that up to 400 dwellings could be provided on such sites in the Outer North East as infill sites or as extensions. The approach is flawed and therefore unsound. To be consistent the Council must revisit the process and consider the sites which fall within the Others Rural, in the same fashion as those which have been subject to the Council's appraisal process.

Land to the north of Woodlands Drive extends to some 12 hectares and is promoted for housing and ancillary uses. The landowner Foxlow Ltd has specified that the site would be brought forward solely for the purposes of delivering affordable housing for rent at reasonable levels.

This would comprise a mix of housing of different types to include two and three bedroomed semi detached, terraced properties and single storey almshouse style bungalows principally in the south and eastern part of the site. The social mix would mean there could be property suitable for young singles, young families, middle aged families, older couples and retired. Housing would be provided to comply with Building for Life standards.

The extent of the site will allow the creation of open spaces, tree lined avenues, and children's play areas, along with substantial landscaped areas. The delivery of ancillary facilities will also be considered. In partnership with the City Council, Foxlow Ltd would set up a Charity/Foundation and seek to fund, build and deliver the housing, with the expectation that property will be designed and constructed to meet sustainable homes standards to be low energy, eco-friendly, and extremely well insulated. Submission of the site through the Site Allocations process is being undertaken to open and encourage positive discussion with a view to bringing forward an outline application.

In considering this new site, we would suggest that the emerging proposals for the adjoining Trading Estate must be taken into account. It is clear that the City Council considers the Trading Estate to be an inherently sustainable location; given the submitted Core Strategy policy position and subject to addressing specific concerns which were raised by the 2006 UDP Review Inspector on accessibility and sustainability. Matters set out in the application particularly the supporting Planning Statement, the Design and Access Statement and the TA/Travel Plan suggest that the site will be in close proximity to the proposed community facilities, the new school and new village centre. Enhanced bus routes including the 770 and a new shuttle/hopper service will; improve accessibility. On this basis we would suggest that the SHLAA site 1241 represents sustainable location for housing development.

Taking these matters on board it is worth briefly considering the Foxlow site to the north of Woodlands Drive with the provisions of Policy SP6:

i) Sustainability

The site is on the route of the 770 bus which provides regular services to Wetherby Harrogate and Leeds. Thorp Arch Trading Estate provides one of the largest employment locations to the north east of Leeds.

The Hatfield Estate Page 8 of 12

Land to west of Walton Road Thorp Arch SHLAA 1241.

ii) Brownfield Preference

This site is greenfield, in arable use. It is well related to the urban development on adjoining sites to the south, east and north.

iii) Green Belt

Not specifically relevant as it is not Green Belt so could come forward without impacting upon Green Belt purposes.

iv) Distinctiveness

The site is surrounded by housing and built development which for the most part offers limited distinctiveness.

v) Delivery and Build Out rates

The site is put forward and promoted by Foxlow Ltd for the purposes of providing affordable housing. Foxlow would seek to fund, develop and build the site in a partnership with the Council and other providers.

Development of the site could be brought forward in the early part of the Plan period. It is considered that housing development for affordable housing on the site would be complementary to the current RHPUT proposals on the Trading Estate with future development (and residents) benefiting from (and contributing to) those proposals.

vi) Greenspace

As an arable field the site has limited nature conservation interest although retention of boundary hedgerows and inclusion of a structural landscaping and a nature conservation strip on the northern and western flanks could contribute broadly to green corridors.

vii) Flood Risk

Analysis of the Environment Agency mapping suggests that the site is outwith any area of flood risk.

Having considered the merits of the site with the components of Policy SP6 we are of the view that the delivery of affordable housing on this site is consistent with the broad aims of the policy. We are also of the view that the site could come forward as complementary to the RHPUT proposals.

The site is promoted by willing owners and is suitable, achievable and deliverable. On the basis of this material we consider that the Council's appraisal of this new site should be GREEN.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Foxlow Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS05364**

Representation ID: REP05961      Question Ref: H11

Housing

In general we do not consider that housing sites should be phased over particular periods of the Core Strategy, as this is a matter for the market to determine. Foxlow submits the site for the purpose of bringing the land forward for affordable housing. Government guidance is clear that the focus of the planning system should be to significantly boost housing delivery to support economic growth and address issues of affordability. We would consider that this land to the north of Woodlands Drive could come forward over the duration of the Local Plan period, without detriment to the Core Strategy (given the approach to the adjoining Trading Estate) and the spatial development strategy within it.

Thorp Arch is a strong housing market area where affordability is an issue and this site is of sufficient scale to deliver affordable housing over several years.

Representation ID: REP05961      Question Ref: H14

Housing

Land north of Woodland Drive Thorp Arch. This is a new site which is being promoted expressly for the purposes of providing affordable housing. Part of the site may be appropriate for housing for older people as well as other specific housing requirements.

Representation ID: REP05961      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Within the Submitted Core Strategy, the Spatial Development Strategy (Spatial Policy 1 and Table 1) suggests that Wetherby is the principal settlement in the Outer North East. Bardsey, Barwick-in-Elmet, Boston Spa, Bramham, Collingham and Scholes are all identified as Smaller Settlements. There is a distinction within the Smaller Settlements with Boston Spa and Collingham identified as Local Centres offering a range of shops and other local facilities, with the consequence they are able to accommodate more development. Outside of this defined Settlement hierarchy the remainder of the Outer North East falls within the Villages and Rural.

SP1 suggests that Wetherby is the principal settlement in the Outer North East. Bardsey, Barwick-in-Elmet, Boston Spa, Bramham, Collingham and Scholes are all identified as Smaller Settlements. There is a distinction within the Smaller Settlements with Boston Spa and Collingham identified as Local Centres offering a range of shops and other local facilities, with the consequence they are able to accommodate more development.

Giving consideration to Table 2, this indicates the broad distribution between the levels of the settlement hierarchy. Extrapolating for the Outer North East, this suggests suggesting that 60% of the requirement should be around the major settlements 32% around the Smaller Settlements and the remaining 8% in Other Rural, which would include land around Walton village and to the north of Woodlands Drive. Within the Outer North East, the situation is somewhat complicated by constraints around Wetherby and the presence of the Thorp Arch Trading Estate. There is inherent support within the Core Strategy for the redevelopment of the Trading Estate site which offers in part a major brownfield opportunity. Landowner Rockspring Hanover Property Unit Trust has submitted an outline planning application for the site (13/03134/OT) which proposes some 2,000 residential units, along with highway and other infrastructure. Whilst the application remains to be determined, it is a consideration which proposes an ambitious delivery of 135 dwelling units per year with construction starting by mid-2014.

Part of the proposal includes the provision of social and community infrastructure, including a school, playing fields and local shops. Delivery is dependent upon the provision of an access road (the Western Relief Road) from Walton Gates to a position south of the Wealstun Prison. We have concerns regarding the Council's approach to Thorp Arch and that its approach to the identification of land in the area is not consistent. Leeds City Council has gone through a process of assessing land against the settlement hierarchy (SP1) but then sieved out land which does not comply with the identified settlements in that hierarchy, particularly those within the area classified as "Other Rural". This would be contrary to Policy SP6 which suggests that a proportion of housing will be delivered in the Other Rural category; it expects that 50% of that housing will be on infill sites and 50% as extensions to settlements/villages. For the District this implies that 2% of the 70,000 or so houses to be built (i.e. 1,400 units) will be built in the Other Rural areas. This can be extrapolated to the Outer North East to be around 400 units. It is not appropriate that the Council has simply sieved out these sites; the approach is flawed and therefore unsound. We would consider that this approach should be applied to sites which adjoin the existing settlements above and that the Council should undertake a rigorous appraisal of those sites along with any submitted as part of the Issues and Options Appraisal.

---

**Name: Robert Unwin**

**Representor No: PRS05366**

Representation ID: REP05962      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05962      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

# General Comments

**Name:** Patricia Unwin

**Representor No:** PRS05367

Representation ID: REP05964      Question Ref: H10 Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.  
There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.  
The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.  
Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.  
The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05964      Question Ref: H10 Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

# General Comments

**Name: Hatfeild Estate**

**Representor No: PRS05368**

Representation ID: REP05966      Question Ref: H11

Housing

In general we do not consider that housing sites should be phased over particular periods of the Core Strategy, as this is a matter for the market to determine.

Government guidance is clear that the focus of the planning system should be to significantly boost housing delivery to support economic growth and address issues of affordability. We would consider that this land at Walton Road could come forward over the duration of the Local Plan period, without detriment to the Core Strategy (given the approach to the adjoining Trading Estate) and the spatial development strategy within it.

Thorp Arch is a strong housing market area and this site is of sufficient scale to deliver housing over several years.

Representation ID: REP05966      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

There is support for the designation of Boston Spa as a settlement capable of accommodating housing and employment growth, to meet the objectively assessed needs of the District, with Thorp Arch village seen as a contiguous part of the settlement. Other parts of the Parish could also be seen as major urban settlements for example around Walton Road.

Within the Core Strategy, the Spatial Development Strategy (Spatial Policy 1 and Table 1) suggests that Wetherby is the principal settlement in the Outer North East. Bardsey, Barwick-in-Elmet, Boston Spa, Bramham, Collingham and Scholes are all identified as Smaller Settlements. There is a distinction within the Smaller Settlements with Boston Spa and Collingham identified as Local Centres offering a range of shops and other local facilities, with the consequence they are able to accommodate more development. Outside of this defined Settlement hierarchy the remainder of the Outer North East falls within the Villages and Rural. Giving consideration to Table 2, this indicates the broad distribution between the levels of the settlement hierarchy. Extrapolating for the Outer North East, this suggests suggesting that 60% of the requirement should be around the major settlements 32% around the Smaller Settlements and the remaining 8% in Other Rural.

Within the Outer North East, the situation is somewhat complicated by constraints around Wetherby and the presence of the Thorp Arch Trading Estate. There is inherent support within the Core Strategy for the redevelopment of the Trading Estate site which offers in part a major brownfield opportunity. Landowner Rockspring Hanover Property Unit Trust has submitted an outline planning application for the site (13/03134/OT) which proposes some 2,000 residential units, along with highway and other infrastructure. Whilst the application remains to be determined, it is a consideration which proposes an ambitious delivery of 135 dwelling units per year with construction starting by mid-2014.

Part of the proposal includes the provision of social and community infrastructure, including a school, playing fields and local shops. Delivery is dependent upon the provision of an access road (the Western Relief Road) from Walton Gates to a position south of the Wealstun Prison. It will cross over part of the SHLAA site 1241.

Taking these considerations into account, we are of the view that the Council's approach to Thorp Arch is not consistent nor is its approach to the identification of land in the area.

Leeds City Council has gone through a process of assessing land against the settlement hierarchy (SP1) but then sieved out land which does not comply with the identified settlements in that hierarchy. This would be contrary to Policy SP6 which suggests that a proportion of housing will be delivered in the Other Rural category; it expects that 50% of that housing will be on infill sites and 50% as extensions to villages.

For the District this implies that 2% of the 70,000 or so houses to be built (i.e. 1,400 units) will be built in the Other Rural areas. This can be extrapolated to the Outer North East to be around 400 units. It is not appropriate that the Council has simply sieved out these sites; the approach is flawed and therefore unsound

Given the comments above we would consider that this approach should be applied to sites which adjoin the existing settlements above and that the Council should undertake a rigorous appraisal of those sites along with any submitted as part of the Issues and Options Appraisal.



# General Comments

**Name: Hatfeild Estate**

**Representor No: PRS05368**

Representation ID: REP06002      Question Ref: H10

Housing

As explained previously the existing TABS Cricket Ground was not submitted to the earlier Call for Sites. Following discussions with the Cricket Club, however, it is considered appropriate to put the site forward, although such consideration being given on the basis of complying with the provisions of UDP Policy N6.

Land at Thorp Arch Cricket Ground was not submitted as part of the 2008 Call for Sites given the use of the site by the Thorp Arch and Boston Spa Cricket Club (TABS). The site is subject of an N6 Protected Playing Pitch notation on the RUDP Proposal Map. Given the policy position and the active use of the Cricket Ground it was considered inappropriate to put forward the Cricket Ground at that time.

Subsequent discussion with the TABS CC during the winter of 2012 has revealed that whilst the Cricket Ground is well used, the facilities and ground fall below current standards and are in need of upgrade and improvement. The Cricket pitch itself is well maintained, but small; the nature of the site surrounded by residential development is small and does not allow for expansion. TABS CC resolved to collaborate with the Hatfeild Estate to consider opportunities to relocate to a new ground and release the existing ground for development. Correspondence to this effect is included at Appendix A.

Carter Jonas approached the Thorp Arch Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (TANP) during early 2013 to discuss the potential options and progress with the TANP. It was understood that the Steering Group prepared a questionnaire and this produced results which valued the presence of the Cricket Club within the village. Varying degrees of support for different scales of development around the Parish were expressed; protection of the environs of Thorp Arch village was also important.

Discussions with the TANP steering group suggested a desire for a village hall, play space, accommodation for downsizing, although the survey results did not appear to back up or clarify the requirements.

TABS Cricket Ground extends to 0.9ha and is considered appropriate for around 10 residential units. Access would be taken from Hall Park Drive, with the demolition/remodelling of No 21 Thorp Arch Park. The site could be considered suitable as a potential windfall site, or as an infill site in the context of Policy SP7 given its location within the village development limit.

Taking these matters on board, it is worth briefly considering the Cricket Ground with the provisions of Policy SP6. For the most part we would consider that the proposals are the same as for 1240A and 1289A above; albeit the site is part brownfield. Similar levels of interest (very high) have been expressed from house builders.

On the basis of the foregoing, we consider the SHLAA site 1241 to be available, suitable and deliverable. We would consider that the Council should categorise this as GREEN, although the N6 designation would indicate that the site would be AMBER.

In the light of the discussions with TANP the requirements of TABSCC were clarified and these were considered as part of an optioneering exercise to consider site selection, operational requirement, potential funding and revenue streams along with ancillary facilities such as car parking, equipment storage and potential to accommodate multisports, including year round use.

Alongside the TABS requirement, matters discussed with the TANP Steering Group were also explored. Consistent with these broad parameters and mindful of Sport England Guidance (for standards of provision), the following was used for the exercise:

## 1. For TABS

A 160m by 142m cricket oval

Outfield for nets and training, to accommodate multiple sports, year round

Cricket pavilion of 120 sq.m to provide two changing rooms, a supper room, storage and official's accommodation.

Car parking for 25-30 vehicles, and overflow area (potentially with dual use by the Primary School).

## 2. For the community

A village hall of 460 sq.m, large enough for a badminton court and ancillary accommodation.

Shared car parking

Public open space – with equipped play area approximately 0.2ha.

Carter Jonas appointed a consultant team to explore options for the above based on a

notional residential development of around 25 dwellings. Three options were presented to

an open meeting in early July 2013 to explore the acceptability and principle of development.

Indicative layouts are contained in Appendix B. A brief synopsis of each option follows:

## Option 1

This proposal suggests the provision of twenty five dwellings with a compact form of development to the north of Dowkell Lane at its junction with Wood Lane, along with

development of the existing Ground. A new Cricket Ground with pavilion could form green

edge and retains a link with the village. A new village hall would be provided along with

shared car parking. The housing would comprise a mix of family housing:

Former Cricket Ground

9 units 4/5 bedroom detached

Dowkell Lane

16 units 4 (2 bed) apartments,

2 (2 bed) semi bungalows

6 (3 bed) semi-detached and

4 (4/5 bed) detached houses

## Options 2 (and 3)

These options consider the potential to maintain the existing Cricket Ground as a

# General Comments

**Name: Hatfeild Estate**

**Representor No: PRS05368**

secondary/reserve pitch for TABS. This scheme nominally includes 26 dwellings; provision to the north of Dowkell Lane would replicate Option 1, but would see a modest housing development to the south of Dowkell Lane comprising:

10 units 4 (3 bed) semi-detached and  
6 (4/5 bed) detached houses

Option 3 Varies from Option 2 in that Cricket Ground located to south of Dowkell Lane at its junction with Church Causeway (part of SHLAA site 1239).

On the basis of the above, the following representation seeks appropriate recognition and categorisation of the housing sites within and on the edge of Thorp Arch village. For the purposes of clarity these are considered as:

- Thorp Arch Cricket Ground (new site)
- Corner of Dowkell Lane and Wood Lane (Site 1289A), plus village Hall
- Land at Dowkell Lane South (Site 1240A)

Plans indicating the extent of these areas are contained in Appendix C

Representation ID: REP06002      Question Ref: H11

Housing

In general we do not consider that housing sites should be phased over particular periods of the Core Strategy, as this is a matter for the market to determine.

Government guidance is clear that the focus of the planning system should be to significantly boost housing delivery to support economic growth and address issues of affordability. We would consider that these sites in Thorp Arch could come forward over the duration of the Local Plan period, without detriment to the Core Strategy (given the approach to the adjoining Trading Estate) and the spatial development strategy within it.

Thorp Arch is a strong housing market area and the sites are of a sufficient scale to deliver housing over several years, coinciding with relocation of the Cricket Pitch.

Representation ID: REP06002      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

There is support for the designation of Boston Spa as a settlement capable of accommodating housing and employment growth, to meet the objectively assessed needs of the District, with Thorp Arch village seen as a contiguous part of the settlement.

Within the Core Strategy, the Spatial Development Strategy (Spatial Policy 1 and Table 1) suggests that Wetherby is the principal settlement in the Outer North East. Bardsey, Barwick-in-Elmet, Boston Spa, Bramham, Collingham and Scholes are all identified as Smaller Settlements. There is a distinction within the Smaller Settlements with Boston Spa and Collingham identified as Local Centres offering a range of shops and other local facilities, with the consequence they are able to accommodate more development. Outside of this defined Settlement hierarchy the remainder of the Outer North East falls within the Villages and Rural.

Giving consideration to Table 2, this indicates the broad distribution between the levels of the settlement hierarchy. Extrapolating for the Outer North East, this suggests suggesting that 60% of the requirement should be around the major settlements 32% around the Smaller Settlements and the remaining 8% in Other Rural.

Taking these considerations into account, we are of the view that the Council's approach to Thorp Arch is not consistent nor is its approach to the identification of land in the area.

Leeds City Council has gone through a process of assessing land against the settlement hierarchy (SP1) but then sieved out land which does not comply with the identified settlements in that hierarchy.

Our view is that Thorp Arch village is contiguous with Boston Spa and functions as an integral part of the settlement. Residents of the village are within an easy pleasant walk to Boston Spa local shopping centre; more so than component parts of Boston Spa. We

contend that Thorp Arch is part of the Smaller Settlement and therefore the Council is wrong to "sieve out" sites within and adjoining the village.

If Thorp Arch village is to maintain its current status Policy SP6 suggests that a proportion of housing will be delivered in the Other Rural category; it expects that 50% of that housing will be on infill sites and 50% as extensions to villages.

For the District this implies that 2% of the 70,000 or so houses to be built (i.e. 1,400 units)

will be built in the Other Rural areas. This can be extrapolated to the Outer North East to be around 400 units. It is not appropriate that the Council has simply sieved out these sites; the approach is flawed and therefore unsound

Representation ID: REP06014      Question Ref: G4

Greenspace

Yes to the extent that facilities should meet modern day standards; although if existing sites so constrained that they are unable to satisfy modern standards, then facilitating better facilities on other appropriate sites should be an appropriate alternative.

Representation ID: REP06014      Question Ref: G5

Greenspace

These proposals consider the potential relocation of the Thorp Arch and Boston Spa Cricket Ground to land off Dowkell Lane along with residential development, the provision of community facilities and open space. These proposals have been the subject of discussions with Thorp Arch and Boston Spa Cricket Club (TABS) and the Thorp Arch Neighbourhood Plan Group (TANP). Preliminary engagement with the community included an open evening arranged by TANP, attended principally by those residents with properties overlooking the Cricket Ground.

Yes; the basis of these representations is the desire for the TABS Cricket Club to secure improved cricket facilities, which can accommodate other sports uses on a year round basis. The options set out at Appendix B consider provision of community facilities and a replacement/alternate cricket ground on part of SHLAA site 1289 or 1240.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Hatfeild Estate**

**Representor No: PRS05368**

Representation ID: REP06014      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Currently there is limited or no children's play area available in the Thorp Arch village; such facilities could be provided as part of a community hub.

---

**Name: Lisa Drayton**

**Representor No: PRS05369**

Representation ID: REP05965      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05965      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any

development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Barbara Kelly**

**Representor No: PRS05370**

Representation ID: REP05967      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05967      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any

development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Jenny Carter**

**Representor No: PRS05371**

Representation ID: REP05968      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any

development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05968      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Maria Bedford**

**Representor No: PRS05372**

Representation ID: REP05969      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05969      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any

development of Green Site 31008.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Paul Bedford**

**Representor No: PRS05373**

Representation ID: REP05970      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05970      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: John Burland**

**Representor No: PRS05374**

Representation ID: REP05971      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05971      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Gwenne Cooke**

**Representor No: PRS05375**

Representation ID: REP05972      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05972      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Cynthia Stenton**

**Representor No: PRS05376**

Representation ID: REP05973      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05973      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Ann Newsome**

**Representor No: PRS05377**

Representation ID: REP05974      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05974      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Andy Walker**

**Representor No: PRS05378**

Representation ID: REP05977      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05977      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Susan Walker**

**Representor No: PRS05379**

Representation ID: REP05978      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05978      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Robin Greenwood**

**Representor No: PRS05380**

Representation ID: REP05979      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05979      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Julie Greenwood**

**Representor No: PRS05381**

Representation ID: REP05980      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05980      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: James Gill**

**Representor No: PRS05382**

Representation ID: REP05981      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05981      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Louise Gill**

**Representor No: PRS05383**

Representation ID: REP05982      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05982      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: S Furness**

**Representor No: PRS05386**

Representation ID: REP05984      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05984      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

# General Comments

---

**Name: E Howson**

**Representor No: PRS05387**

Representation ID: REP05985      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05985      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: K Harvey**

**Representor No: PRS05388**

Representation ID: REP05986      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05986      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: S Win**

**Representor No: PRS05389**

Representation ID: REP05987      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05987      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: K Bolton**

**Representor No: PRS05390**

Representation ID: REP05988      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05988      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

# General Comments

---

**Name: Margaret Street**

**Representor No: PRS05391**

Representation ID: REP05989      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05989      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Margaret Bolton**

**Representor No: PRS05392**

Representation ID: REP05991      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05991      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: K & M Wallis**

**Representor No: PRS05393**

Representation ID: REP05992      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05992      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Derek Johnson**

**Representor No: PRS05394**

Representation ID: REP05993      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05993      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.



# General Comments

---

**Name: Beverley Johnson**

**Representor No: PRS05396**

Representation ID: REP05994      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05994      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: B Shakespeare**

**Representor No: PRS05397**

Representation ID: REP05996      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05996      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: J Hiorns**

**Representor No: PRS05398**

Representation ID: REP05997      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP05997      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: T Goldthorpe**

**Representor No: PRS05399**

Representation ID: REP05998      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP05998      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

# General Comments

---

**Name: Richard Trusson**

**Representor No: PRS05400**

Representation ID: REP05999      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing to say that I am opposed to any new development in Calverley what so ever at this time. This is for a variety of reasons;

There is already significant new housing either being built or already built within a few miles of Calverley, for example the old factory site on Low Hall Road. There has been no corresponding increase in local facilities, especially school places, to accommodate increased numbers of school aged children. The catchment area for Calverley Parkside is now measured tens of meters from the school, certainly any new housing will fall outside this, where do you expect children to go? The church school in the village is no better off and suffers from chronic shortage of parking space leading to some very dangerous situations at the start and end of the school day.

While there has been an attempt to reduce traffic flow through the village I have not seen any noticeable impact. Unless you count the recent impact outside my house of a car cutting the corner and driving on the wrong side of the road knocking a cyclist off. While thankfully crashes are rare cutting the corner, speeding and high volumes of traffic are not. Proposal 1124 would be expected to increase the traffic flow along Hollin Park Drive and Upper Car Lane, we saw an increase in traffic after the conversion of the old Yorkshire Water site to the immediate west of 1124.

If any of these developments were to go ahead, and I oppose all of them, significant investment must be made in increasing facilities within the village and creating infrastructure links to Leeds and Bradford. For example did you know you cannot catch a direct bus from Calverley to New Pudsey Train Station? Adding a route would help there. Actually blocking some of the roads in the village, for example the Hollin Park Drive/Woodhall Road junction, the St Stephens Road/ Carr Hill Avenue junction would, I believe, reduce rat running. It would also cause me problems however I accept those as the price for reducing traffic in the village. Changing the choke point junction of the A657 and A658 to improve traffic flow would reduce the need to rat run.

I would also be interested to see what evidence there is for a demand for new housing. Have all the houses been sold at the existing new developments in the near area? Who have they been sold to? Private families or speculators? Calverley is lucky in that it still has a village 'feel', mainly I think because there is a clear gap between it and its surrounding urban neighbours. The proposed developments risk losing this and the separate identity Calverley has.

---

**Name: P Templeton**

**Representor No: PRS05401**

Representation ID: REP06001      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06001      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: S Chadwick**

**Representor No: PRS05402**

Representation ID: REP06005      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I wish to lodge my opposition to the proposed planning development for Calverley.

These sites will mean an even greater amount of traffic using the local roads, there will be a loss of 'green' space. The local schools are already full, so where would families send there children to school. There is a very limited bus service between Calverley and Pudsey so residents would need to use their cars all the time adding to pollution.

If planners are intent on increasing the size of Calverley the village will lose its identity.

# General Comments

---

**Name: J Adams**

**Representor No: PRS05403**

Representation ID: REP06007      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06007      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: R.m Groom**

**Representor No: PRS05404**

Representation ID: REP06009      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06009      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: S Betteridge**

**Representor No: PRS05405**

Representation ID: REP06010      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06010      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Hoare**

**Representor No: PRS05410**

Representation ID: REP06016      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Site 1332

Sites shaded green are considered to be the most suitable sites for development i.e they are free from physical constraints. Our client agrees that the sites shaded green represent the most suitable sites for allocation.

See also representation submitted for full details

Representation ID: REP06016      Question Ref: H7

Housing

Site 1332

There are 69 red sites which have provisionally been discounted by the council mainly due to the impact on the Green Belt. While it is accepted that Green Belt sites will need to be released to make up the shortfall in available land, it is essential that the most sustainable and appropriate sites are brought forward.

Our client therefore agrees with the councils approach to discounting sites which will have a negative impact on the Green Belt and all the sites indentified in red.

# General Comments

---

**Name: H Hammond**

**Representor No: PRS05413**

Representation ID: REP06018      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06018      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Emma Goldthorpe**

**Representor No: PRS05414**

Representation ID: REP06019      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06019      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Michael Anderson**

**Representor No: PRS05415**

Representation ID: REP06021      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06021      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Maureen Anderson**

**Representor No: PRS05416**

Representation ID: REP06023      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06023      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Krystina Charles**

**Representor No: PRS05417**

Representation ID: REP06022      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

To whom this may concern,

Please accept this email as my formal objection to the development of 373 houses in the Robin Hood.

I feel that the proposal is excessive and the infrastructure that is already in place would be unable to cope with any further stress upon its already current fragile state. Our local schools are already filled to capacity as well local amenities such as doctors and dentists.

I feel a project of this size would devalue our area and the proposed sites would only further stress our volatile busy carriageway of Leadwell Lane.

---

**Name: Eva Page**

**Representor No: PRS05418**

Representation ID: REP06025      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06025      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Archie Warman**

**Representor No: PRS05419**

Representation ID: REP06024      Question Ref: R4

Retail

The Representations are submitted by Newbridge Capital Investments Limited and relates to land at York Towers, located to the north of the A64, York Road, in Burmantofts and Richmond Hill area of the City.

The land to which these representations relate and which is in the control, of Newbridge Capital Investments Limited is identified on the attached site plan.

The Leeds Core Strategy identifies a requirement for a new Town Centre allocation to allow retail development to come forward over the plan period to meet the needs of the residents of the Richmond Hill Area.

Within the Issues and Options for the Plan document, a site is not identified to meet this firm retail requirement.

Newbridge Capital Investment Limited requests that the site at York Towers is allocated as part of a Town Centre to serve the Richmond Hill area. The following attributes of the site lend themselves to an allocation for retail development:

- 1.The site can be amalgamated with adjacent land to form a suitably large site to accommodate a retail scheme. In combination with this adjacent land and existing nearby retail and commercial uses,
- 2.The site is highly accessible, being located on the main north west arterial route from Leeds City Centre, well served by public transport, easily reached by servicing vehicles without conflict within residential area. The site lies in proximity to highly populated residential areas of inner Leeds, from where an identified need for convenient retail provision has been identified by the City Council.
- 3.The land in respect of which these representations are made has remained underused for a considerable period of time. In particular, the York Towers office property is an unattractive proposition for office occupiers and the viability of the office purpose is at best, questionable. A new use for this site is required to be found in any event. The site is therefore available for development for town centre/retail purposes in the short term.
- 4.The general location of the York Towers site is subject to consideration for allocation for additional housing or mixed use and employment development. The designation of the York Towers site as the central component of a Town Centre allocation would both complement the surrounding existing uses in the area as well as those proposed within the draft Site Allocations Plan (eg sites CFMS001, 1145A and 3411).

Newbridge Capital Investments Limited is committed to bringing the York Towers site forward for development and in this regard, will be investigating the potential incorporation of the adjacent lands as part of a more substantial development proposal. The company will work with Leeds City Council to secure the delivery of the site and would therefore request that the site is allocated as a Town Centre in order to facilitate this approach and provide the necessary certainty required to underpin the promotion of the site in this regard.

Site plan attached.

# General Comments

<b>Name: Derek Page</b>		
<b>Representor No: PRS05421</b>		
Representation ID: REP06028	Question Ref: H10	Housing
Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf		
Representation ID: REP06028	Question Ref: H10	Housing
See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now. There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application. The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary. Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application. The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.		

# General Comments

---

**Name: Collingham Neighbourhood Planning Committee And Collingham With Linton Parish Council**

**Representor No: PRS05422**

Representation ID: REP05940      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

The following comments have been provided in relation to all the proposed sites in Collingham:

## Character

Collingham retains an individual character, which helps define it as a village; residents are clear that any development permitted must not detract from that character. This means that amenities and open space must be retained and impact on green fields and Green Belt land must be minimised. Development must not encourage the merging of Collingham with its neighbouring parishes.

## General Infrastructure

Before Collingham can accept any more development, plans must be put in place to develop the supporting infrastructure; this includes adequate schooling, roads, drainage, public transport, communication (such as broadband) and health care provision. Improvements should be provided in advance of any housing development and not retrospectively after development has been allowed to begin.

## Traffic

The volume and the speed of traffic is a major concern amongst the residents of Collingham. Before Collingham can accept any more development, plans must be put in place to show how traffic is going to be managed along both the A58 and A659 corridors. These plans need to consider how the junctions of Harewood Road and A58 and the A58 with Wattle Syke will cope with increased traffic. Improvements should be provided in advance of any housing development.

Further afield, the junction of A61 and A659 suffers chronic congestion with queues regularly 1.5 miles long. With increasing housing in Outer North West Leeds and also in north Bradford traffic will only increase; similarly this route is used as access to Leeds/Bradford Airport. Expansion plans will increase traffic through Collingham and we do not want traffic queuing through East Keswick and into Collingham. It is also noted that this is an HGV route to Otley and beyond.

Consideration should be given to providing housing closer to the main employment centres and also close to cycle infrastructure. Collingham is served poorly by both.

## Ridge Lines

Collingham is a hilly village with numerous ridgelines – the protection of these ridges has been identified within the Collingham Parish Plan and Village Design Statement. Any development must respect these ridgelines and ensure new houses do not dominate views from elsewhere in the village.

## Flooding

Collingham has a history of flooding, both from the River Wharfe and from the Beck that flows through the village centre. Any development should be directed away from the flood zones of Collingham Beck and The River Wharfe. Any permitted developments must not increase the risk of future flooding. Priority should be given to sites downstream from the flood zone or to sites at a considerable distance from the fields that directly or indirectly contribute towards flooding of the floodplain or drainage within the village.

## Wildlife

Local flora and fauna is an important component of Collingham's rural environment. Habitat surveys would be required and mitigation measures would need to be included to protect any wildlife affected by any development. Species commented on include bats, barn owls, tawny owls, woodpecker and deer. Specific to some of the sites might be species appropriate to flood zone or meadow habitats.

## Wetherby

Wetherby is Collingham's nearest major urban settlement. Facilities already struggle to cope with demand and plans need to provide for additional general infrastructure and, for example, additional grocery retail space and additional vehicle parking.

## Housing Demand

Comments would suggest that there is a demand for more affordable housing. Any housing provided in Collingham is likely to be expensive and only the proportion set aside as affordable would be available to help meet this demand.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Collingham Neighbourhood Planning Committee And Collingham With Linton Parish Council**

**Representor No: PRS05422**

Representation ID: REP05940      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

For full details see rep.

The Collingham Neighbourhood Planning Committee fully supports the ideal of positive planning as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. Collingham has undertaken considerable activity to engage with the local community and to establish its feedback on site allocations and to determine both the benefits and drawbacks to development. It is this feedback that has been used to arrive at the conclusions in this report.

Second consultation – June 2013

The second consultation exercise was held in June 2013 and around 280 Collingham residents attended the walk-in meeting hosted in the village hall. Drawings were presented showing all Collingham's SHLAA sites annotated with comments abstracted from the Leeds City Council Draft Site Allocations Plan and comments prepared by Collingham Neighbourhood Planning Committee. The latter were largely derived from the September 2012 consultation. Where they exist, proposed plans from developers and landowners were also displayed.

Alec Shelbrooke MP, Councillor Matthew Robinson, Ian Mackay of Leeds City Council and elected members of Collingham with Linton Parish Council also attended the walk-in meeting. On the second day of the meeting, an open Question & Answer session was held with questions fielded by Ian Mackay, Councillor Robinson and Julian Holmes, who acted as host.

Villagers were invited to provide their thoughts on:

1. the Leeds City Council comments from the Draft Site Allocations Plan,
2. whether they considered sites suitable for development
3. the strategic sites proposed at Thorp Arch Trading Estate & Spen Common.
4. green space within the parish
5. the proposal to classify Collingham as a Local Centre (rather than a village).

Comments forms were made available within the meeting and online and parishioners could also comment via a collection box within the Post Office.

In total, 204 feedback forms were received, which contained 475 comments on individual topics and SHLAAs & developments. These comments were entered verbatim into a spreadsheet and were broken down into their component elements. In addition, comments were broken down into their relevance by SHLAA/site and were classified as either Pro (i.e. in favour of development on a site) or Con (i.e. opposed to development on a site) to establish a general parish view by site.

The output from the consultation exercise was analysed and discussed in detail over several weekly meetings of the Collingham Neighbourhood Plan Group. The output and the comments from the exercise have been explored in detail across each site in turn and were developed to form this document.

Representation ID: REP06036      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

109 comments were received relating to Green Space. Many of the general public have not recognised the difference between open countryside and land designated as Green space for public use.

Collingham is lucky to have a number of public green spaces close to the heart of the village, and many commented that this provides character to the village. Any new development needs to therefore replicate this character by providing well located and well designed open space.

There was also concern expressed about sufficiency of leisure and play facilities in the event that development takes place and the population increases. Consideration needs to be given to providing alternative facilities in conjunction with development.



# General Comments

---

**Name: Helen Ledger**

**Representor No: PRS05424**

---

Representation ID: REP06031      Question Ref: G2

Greenspace

Any changes from playing fields to other green space typologies or other development should be based on supply-demand site specific assessments on teams and clubs, factoring in whether they are likely to see changes in membership over time or whether their current sites are over played; and not just based on a ratio of people to pitches. A loss for sport would need to meet our playing fields policy as set out above.

---

Representation ID: REP06031      Question Ref: G4

Greenspace

Agree - investment to be sought for poor quality sites. This should be done on a prioritised basis development alongside input from Sport England and sports governing bodies who have also the potential to invest their own capital through grant funding. NB pitch improvement works such as drainage may require planning consent as engineering works.

---

Representation ID: REP06031      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

It is clear more and finer grain evidence is required to effectively answer these questions on improvements or changes to playing fields. Sport England would be happy to support the council further on developing further research

---

Representation ID: REP06031      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

It is erroneous to exclude all education sites where sports clubs currently have established access whether this is via a formal community use agreement or not. This gives a false impression of supply. In developing the options further more research is needed to develop a better data set. If there are schools with no current community access then opening them up outside school hours will help meet the current unmet demands preventing unnecessary investment in facilities

---

Representation ID: REP06031      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Indoor built sports facilities. We are working with the council to develop needs and evidence to support strategic planning for swimming pools and sports halls. This may result in the rationalisation of facilities, and indeed already has with the South Leeds Sports Centre pool, based in part on our Facilities Planning Modelling tool. We would propose that this planning document should also consider including the built sports facilities element into this site specific remit given further work is developing on this.

---

Representation ID: REP06031      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

As per our concerns on the lack of a policy direction to resolve the deficits identified in outdoor sport above, the maps were helpful in setting out proposed sites. However we would welcome some accompanying text within the area chapters/volumes of the next draft to explain how the proposed allocations will resolve the deficits. For instance, are these proposed areas well placed to support existing sports clubs and sports' national governing body objectives for growth and investment in new facilities? E.g., "X ha of land made available at X to resolve the shortage of rugby pitches. This will be delivered with the help of the Rugby Football League and the parks and countryside dept to relocate X club to a better ground."

---

Representation ID: REP06031      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

It is clear a number of sub areas/wards have deficits in sports pitches; the approach so far does not always make it clear how these deficits will be resolved.

---

Representation ID: REP06031      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

From our work with the Sports Development Team on strategic planning for facilities we understand the planning policy dept are building on their work in the open space sport and recreation audit to improve the research with more detail. Sport England have not been consulted on this emerging research yet, however would be keen to support this with the information we hold on Active Places Power and the Facilities Planning Model plus linking in with the research our sports' national governing body contacts hold.

---

Representation ID: REP06038      Question Ref: G2

Greenspace

CG2: The city centre green space provision includes no outdoor sports facilities. With increasing numbers of city centre flats and apartments more people now live in the city centre which exacerbates the situation.

---

Representation ID: REP06038      Question Ref: G3

Greenspace

The approach so far does not recognise that an all-weather 5-a-side pitch is available to hire at the rear of 2 Wellington Place; plus an area out green space used for recreation and circuit type fitness sessions. This area will be used by residents and perhaps more so by workers in the adjoining office blocks. The value of this area should be recognised to prevent its loss to development in future.

---

Representation ID: REP06038      Question Ref: G3

Greenspace

We welcome the idea of a south Leeds park but recommend provision is also considered for sport. Any provision south of the city centre will need to have good transport, pedestrian and cycle links to where offices and employment opportunities currently located to the north of the river. Parks offer significant opportunities to support recreation and sport, for instance 'Park Run' a timed 5km course running at weekends currently operating from Roundhay and Hyde park as well as circuit type fitness sessions. Tennis courts are also key features of current Leeds parks and a new park would be an opportunity to develop this sport with the Lawn tennis Association.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Helen Ledger**

**Representor No: PRS05424**

Representation ID: REP06043      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Appendix 1 25/10X Proposed deleted N6 allocation Mount St Mary's High School

The reasons given are: "Developed – Mount St Mary's High School"

This is not very clear, is this just one part of the allocation lost to redevelopment around 2009, or the remaining two senior pitches on the site? We would object if the allocation was deleted on the remaining part of the playing field still in use for sport.

Representation ID: REP06043      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Shakespeare Primary School, Burmantofts

Reason given "Developed – Shakespeare Primary School"

This is not very clear, is this just one part of the allocation lost to redevelopment. There is still one senior grass pitch and a recent all weather artificial grass pitch (AGP) and this site worthy of protection via an N6 allocation.

Representation ID: REP06043      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

TABLE 4.5.1

There are apparent significant deficiencies across all but one wards in this sub area, equating to around a senior pitch (0.4ha) or above in the majority of areas. We note that education provision has been excluded for this assessment which may miss out on some community accessible space. For instance Richmond Hill primary school has a long established link with a rugby league club. This means this picture of unmet demand may not be accurate.

It is fair to seek commuted sums from developers to help resolve identified deficits but where new space is needed for sport, beyond enhancing existing sites, this plan (at later stages) will need to identify where new provision will be created and how this will be deliverable; by creating new playing field sites.

Representation ID: REP06043      Question Ref: General comment

Greenspace

Primrose High School, off Moorehouse Grove, Burmantofts:

This area could be brought back into use to help remedy the local deficiencies in outdoor sport provision identified rather than accepting its loss to alternative development, as would be proposed by deleting the N6 allocation. This would not meet our playing field policy unless there is evidence to demonstrate this is surplus to requirements (current & future) for pitch based sport. This seems unlikely given the findings of the OSSR PPG17 study.

Land no longer in use for sport is not an argument for its disposal to other uses. In Sport England's experience it is more likely this is down to the site owner closing the site off rather than lack of demand to make use of the playing field.

We would object to this change unless one or more of our policy exceptions are met, as set out above, exceptions E1 – E5.

Representation ID: REP06052      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Appendix 1 33/8x Oldfield Lane N6 allocation deletion.

Sport England's statutory role and our playing field policy will still apply on this playing field site now no longer used even though this is identified in the referenced SPD. We would oppose its N6 allocation deletion as this would fail to recognise the site former use and current land use as playing fields/sport and recreation facilities.

Wortley is identified as having a local deficiency in outdoor sport, something this site could help rectify. Regard has to be had to the evidence available and ensure if developed the outdoor sports facilities are replaced like for like in a suitable location.

Land no longer in use for sport is not an argument for its disposal to other uses. In Sport England's experience it is more likely this is down to the site owner closing the site off rather than lack of demand to make use of the playing field for sport.

Furthermore, an assessment on whether other open space typologies are more suitable is required before this is lost to housing development

---

**Name: Amelia & Liam Hampshire**

**Representor No: PRS05425**

Representation ID: REP06032      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Myself and my husband strongly oppose against houses being build in the suggested areas in Calverley. The schools are already over whelmed and the through traffic is terrible. Building more houseS would only increase these problems, therefore we are strongly against this.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Joan Green**

**Representor No: PRS05428**

Representation ID: REP06034      Question Ref: H4

Housing

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.

Representation ID: REP06034      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

As a neighbour to both these sites, I am very passionate about these remaining as they are currently. I purchased my property given the understanding that the site would never be built on, given they are green belt and have issues. I am very concerned that my privacy will be taken away, there will be an impact to the wildlife in this area and that my property value will drop. In addition, 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) which will be exacerbated further by an additional 340 houses.

I really do hope that all concerns are taken into consideration when the consultation period comes to an end.

---

**Name: Lyn Taylor**

**Representor No: PRS05429**

Representation ID: REP06039      Question Ref: H1

Housing

I object to housing development plans for green sites in LS19. My husband and I object STRONGLY and hope to have a reply.

---

**Name: T Storey**

**Representor No: PRS05431**

Representation ID: REP06049      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06049      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: D Cawood**

**Representor No: PRS05432**

Representation ID: REP06051      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06051      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Irwin Cawood**

**Representor No: PRS05433**

Representation ID: REP06054      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06054      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Eunice Butler**

**Representor No: PRS05438**

Representation ID: REP06055      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06055      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Majorie Goldthorpe**

**Representor No: PRS05439**

Representation ID: REP06064      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06064      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Louise Dickinson**

**Representor No: PRS05443**

Representation ID: REP06069      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06069      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

## General Comments

---

**Name: Bramham Parish Council And Neighbourhood Planning Group**

**Representor No: PRS05444**

Representation ID: REP06067      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06067      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Nicholas Calvert**

**Representor No: PRS05447**

Representation ID: REP06073      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06073      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Jennifer Burton**

**Representor No: PRS05448**

Representation ID: REP06075      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06075      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Paul Goldthorpe**

**Representor No: PRS05451**

Representation ID: REP06077      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06077      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Karen Bruce

**Representor No:** PRS05452

Representation ID: REP06074

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

In my ward of Rothwell we have three Neighbourhood Planning Forums which are doing an excellent job and I understand have submitted their own comments on the site allocations. The ward councillors have worked closely with the NFs on these and other related issues.

As a ward councillor I feel that each of these NPFs have given serious consideration to the issues in each respective area - the Carlton Neighbourhood Forum, the Rothwell Neighbourhood Forum and the Oulton and Woodlesford Neighbourhood Forum and I believe that they should have a strong influence and say on the site allocations.

I would therefore like to formally register that as an elected councillor for Rothwell (which also includes Carlton and Oulton and Woodlesford) that I fully support the comments submitted by our three neighbourhood forums and back them up fully.

# General Comments

**Name: Aviva Life And Pensions (UK) Ltd And The Crown Estate**

**Representor No: PRS05453**

Representation ID: REP06080

Question Ref: CCR9

Retail

The representations are focussed on Volume 2:2 of the Site Allocations Plan related to Leeds city centre, and in particular Question CCR9 which seeks agreement, or otherwise, with the "...guidance for retail warehousing (including bulky / home improvement goods retailing)?".

The owners support the proposal at paragraph 2.2.15 to simplify application of the sequential approach where it relates to sites within the city centre boundary.

However, the changes do not go far enough to (i) reflect the existing make up of retail facilities within the city centre boundary, (ii) address the confusion which exists between the definitions of retail warehouse and bulky goods retail development, and (iii) explain how changes in approach are to be regularised between the site allocations plan and the draft core strategy which is to be subject to examination this autumn.

## Definitions of Retail Warehouse Development

It is not reflective of the modern retail market to work on the basis that retail warehouse development will only sell 'bulky goods'.

There are numerous examples in Leeds alone (including at the Crown Point Retail Park) of retailers who trade from retail warehouse, city and town centre locations via different business models in a complementary manner.

Where there is a large and increasingly successful retail centre such as Leeds, the priority for most ('non-bulky') retail businesses will be representation within the primary shopping area of the city centre itself, with retail warehouse representation comprising complementary additional investment in the city, enabling Leeds to compete on an equal footing with other large out of centre, as well as city and town centre retail destinations.

This is not to say that retail warehouse development should be exempt from the standard retail policy tests. However, the drafting of the core strategy and site allocations policies results in a lack of clarity regarding application of these tests to retail warehouse development that will not involve the sale of 'bulky goods'.

## The Sequential Approach

Paragraph 2.2.15 starts by stating that:

"...Core Strategy Policy CC1 and paragraph 5.1.9 provides a sequential approach for proposed retail warehousing favouring the Primary Shopping Area followed by the rest of the City Centre and / or designated areas".

The reference to 'designated areas' relates to the areas historically identified for bulky goods retailing; e.g. Crown Point Retail Park and Regent Street.

The alternative approach recommended within paragraph 2.2.15 is that:

"Beyond the Primary Shopping Area and its fringe, locations within the city centre boundary are preferred because of its superior accessibility by non-car modes of transport and because of the potential for linked trips. A further area of sequential preference would be fringe areas beyond the city centre boundary that are well connected by public transport corridors and that are not more than 300m from the city centre boundary. However, when looking at individual sites it will be important to ensure that retail warehousing does not displace protected uses nor prejudice other policy objectives including other Council strategies and framework".

Removing the reference to 'bulky goods' is welcomed for the reasons outlined above.

However, we feel there is some planning merit in retaining a sequential preference for established retail warehouse (i.e. rather than bulky goods) destinations over and above other areas within the city centre boundary. These include, but are not restricted to, the additional scope for linked trips referred to in the policy, the scope to focus infrastructure improvements to enhancing linkages between these defined areas and the primary shopping area, and greater control over shopping patterns within the city centre.

This would also support the approach outlined within the draft core strategy of encouraging incorporation of the Crown Point Retail Park as an integral part of the city centre retail offer (paragraph 5.1.7). The policy could read something along the lines of:

"Beyond the Primary Shopping Area and its fringe, then the established retail warehouse destination at the Crown Point Retail Park, locations within the city centre boundary are preferred because of its superior accessibility by non-car modes of transport and because of the potential for linked trips...".

## The Core Strategy

Of course, the approach advocated within the site allocations document would need to be regularised with the draft Core Strategy where it refers to 'bulky goods' retailing and destinations.

Any such changes need to be prepared and consulted on prior to formal review at the examination in public.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Kenneth Johnson**

**Representor No: PRS05454**

Representation ID: REP06078      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06078      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Ryan Johnson**

**Representor No: PRS05457**

Representation ID: REP06081      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06081      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: P Harwood**

**Representor No: PRS05458**

Representation ID: REP06084      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06084      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: C Thompson**

**Representor No: PRS05459**

Representation ID: REP06086      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06086      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf



# General Comments

---

**Name: J Thompson**

**Representor No: PRS05462**

Representation ID: REP06088      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06088      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: A Watson**

**Representor No: PRS05463**

Representation ID: REP06089      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06089      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Gordon And Linda Walker**

**Representor No: PRS05464**

Representation ID: REP06091      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Please, we oppose all buildings near Rothwell Haigh and surrounding areas.

---

**Name: B Wright**

**Representor No: PRS05465**

Representation ID: REP06092      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06092      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: A Goldthorpe**

**Representor No: PRS05466**

Representation ID: REP06094      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06094      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

# General Comments

Name: John Perry

Representor No: PRS05469

Representation ID: REP06100      Question Ref: H1

Housing

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

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

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

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

## General Comments

---

**Name: C Copley**

**Representor No: PRS05470**

Representation ID: REP06101      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06101      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP07042      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP07042      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: A Tetley**

**Representor No: PRS05472**

Representation ID: REP06103      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06103      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: B Jubb**

**Representor No: PRS05476**

Representation ID: REP06111      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06111      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

# General Comments

---

**Name: C Whiteley**

**Representor No: PRS05479**

Representation ID: REP06114      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06114      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: L Goldthorpe**

**Representor No: PRS05482**

Representation ID: REP06119      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06119      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: A Muscroft**

**Representor No: PRS05483**

Representation ID: REP06120      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06120      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: B Coughlan**

**Representor No: PRS05485**

Representation ID: REP06123      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06123      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

# General Comments

<b>Name: M Appelby</b>		
<b>Representor No: PRS05489</b>		
Representation ID: REP06127	Question Ref: H10	Housing
Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf		
Representation ID: REP06127	Question Ref: H10	Housing
See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now. There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application. The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary. Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application. The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.		

# General Comments

Name: M Appelby

Representor No: PRS05489

Representation ID: REP06127      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing to object to the proposal to build on the above site at Moseley Wood Bottom.

A further 200 houses added to Cookridge's infrastructure is going to cause many more problems. Cookridge is over-developed currently and any further population additions are going to swell this further.

It is clear to see that the infrastructure cannot cope with this proposal. There are numerous objections that I will detail here for you to consider.

\_Access/Roads/Safety: the only entrance to the proposed site is by Moseley Wood Gardens and then into a small road, Moseley Wood Rise. This road is already busy traffic is plentiful as most houses have 2 cars and street parking is inevitable – indeed driving this road currently can be quite precarious and often dangerous. In winter this is a very hazardous experience indeed with many cars not able to navigate the hilly exits due to ice and snow. Accidents would increase a great deal not to mention the cost and wear of the tarmac that already costs the council time and money.

Increasing traffic to at least an extra 400 cars and all consequent visitors; deliveries; emergency and utility vehicles will make these roads incredibly busy and potentially dangerous.

There is a Primary school on the edge of the Moseley Woods and numerous family's and elderly people to consider. With the increase in traffic, of cars lorries, trucks etc. will need to gain access to the site will cause a serious safety impact on the area. I believe the area currently protects and provides a rare, quiet, safe zone for young children to play in, for dogs and their owners to walk through and for the elderly residents to feel safe getting to the shops.

Opening up the estate to an increase in traffic for the site will also create a 'rat-run' of additional traffic exposing a once tranquil area to a now 'handy short-cut' for impatient drivers.

\_Population increase issues:

\_Medical facilities are already stretched in the area with many residents struggling to receive appointments from local doctors and dentists.

\_Amenities – are there to be more shops built? Will there be further amenities and larger social impact on the area? The strain would be massive on current amenities but the requirement and then execution of developing further would also be incredibly disruptive and there are no obvious sites for any of this?

\_Schools are full in the area. Many of my friends and neighbours in the area have raised the issue of gaining places for their children in the local schools. Indeed we know of families where siblings cannot get places at the local primary school.

\_Public Transport problems; local train station at Horsforth cannot cope with peak travel now and there is insufficient parking for those who use it. The buses already struggle on a very laborious route round the many tricky, tight streets. Added to this the increase numbers using the service and navigating through the increase of car, lorry/truck, site traffic this will become a very overpopulated service.

\_Tinshill Road is already a traffic hot spot and congestion over the bridge due to street parking and the traffic bottlenecks will cause severe delays and additional roadwork's and maintenance to the new supply and demand of the area's traffic needs.

\_The exits to Cookridge are already difficult at peak hours, and they are even more so should any road works be in place. Indeed the numerous times that an accident or issue on the bridge in Horsforth has caused gridlock and created access problems out of Cookridge have increased greatly in the last few years.

\_Flood risks for the train lines – we have had flooding in the past and building will increase water run-off

\_The Ecology will suffer in Moseley Wood Bottom as there are many types of wildlife in the area and at a time when we are supposed to be maintaining these, it seems inconceivable that more habitats will be destroyed.

\_Add to this the years of turning the Moseley Woods into a building site with all the inherent dangers that implies:

\_Noise pollution

\_Dirt, Dust, Debris and Mess – will there be compensation or contribution for cars to be cleaned, carpets to be cleaned, windows to be cleaned?

\_heavy plant vehicles, the impact on the paths and roads their ability to navigate into the site

\_disruption to Internet cables, Phone lines, Gas pipes, water pipes – the impact this will have on the current residents supply, demand and

\_Crime – the percentage of social housing that will be allotted will increase the crime in the area, there will be a massive increase in antisocial behaviour, loitering theft, vandalism

\_Noise pollution as a whole will increase in the area

\_Light pollution \_my brother is a keen astronomer. There is currently an unobstructed view of the sky, and lots of space in an urban setting. Current residents appreciate the quiet, the lack of overexposed light pollution and the space that fields provide.

\_View \_this is one of the most beautiful spots on our area, with some untouched Greenland. It is a beauty spot and a reason for residents to have bought their houses here. It is unfair to remove this

The list is by no means exhaustive but overall, this is clearly an over-development of the area and I think this should be put back as a PAS site in the Plan. I believe the plan to be an ill-conceived and underdeveloped idea and one which has in no way considered the magnitude of its impact on so many.

I believe there are better areas that you could consider before Moseley Wood Bottom – all of which have many means of access and are near

# General Comments

---

**Name: M Appelby**

**Representor No: PRS05489**

major roads.

- Clayton Wood old quarry site
- Boddington Hall
- The West Park centre site
- The defunct Eyrie pub site
- The 3 golf courses (Cookridge, Headingley and Horsforth) within a 3 mile radius – why not consider using some of this privileged land which is used by the few rather than over-extend land which is used by the many?

---

**Name: L Abbey**

**Representor No: PRS05491**

Representation ID: REP06129      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06129      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Gloria Basnett**

**Representor No: PRS05495**

Representation ID: REP06128      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We do not want to lose green belt, congestion in Churwell is bad now, will make it worse....not enough amenities for all these extra households.

---

**Name: Kate Gifford**

**Representor No: PRS05496**

Representation ID: REP06133      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Carplus is a not for profit, environmental transport NGO that promotes accessible, affordable and low-carbon alternatives to traditional car use in the UK. Based in Leeds, we work closely with car club and car sharing providers to promote the concept of shared use rather than car ownership and deliver funding programmes for Transport for London, Transport Scotland and other local authorities.

Carplus supports the main objectives of the LDF consultation on site allocations, particularly in regard to strengthening existing centres which have good public transport access and facilitate low car city living. Car clubs can have benefits for mixed use developments as well as residential developments in the city centre.

We propose that more emphasis should be given to the role that car clubs can play in providing a range of travel options and in supporting low-car and car free development in partnership with reducing car dependence. To this end we suggest that Leeds City Council produces a Supplementary Planning Document, providing guidance on promoting car clubs in housing and mixed use developments as part of its local development framework.

We would be happy to provide some advice on the development of a Supplementary Planning Document – further information on the production of SPDs can be found in our guidance document ‘Car Clubs in Property Developments’ (<http://www.carplus.org.uk/resources/reports/best-practice-guidance/>).

---

**Name: Linton Neighbourhood Plan**

**Representor No: PRS05498**

Representation ID: REP06121      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Considering the current fluid state of the LCC Site Allocation process and the possibility of development proposals being put forward by landowners/developers at any time, we are formulating a robust development section as part of the Linton Neighbourhood Plan. This will clearly set out a framework and guidelines to be taken into account by LCC Planning Department/Planning Inspectorate in dealing with any future planning application for Linton.

Representation ID: REP06121      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Representations have been made to the Linton Steering Group by the landowners of Linton Livery Stables and the adjoining paddock to the south of the livery and their professional advisor. This site has been named “the Green Lane Site” (GL) for the purposes of preparation of the Linton Neighbourhood Plan. Although no application has yet been made for GL to be included in the SHLAA, we anticipate that LCC may receive representations from the landowners of GL, or their professional representative, relating to the possible development of GL for residential housing. If such representations are made, then we would wish GL to be rejected as a possible development site under the current process.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Ann Bats**

**Representor No: PRS05500**

Representation ID: REP06135      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06135      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: E E Crossley**

**Representor No: PRS05503**

Representation ID: REP06139      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06139      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: David Leroy**

**Representor No: PRS05504**

Representation ID: REP06142      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

1. Public consultation on an issue as big as this city wide plan is difficult and expensive. The two documents issued as 'Site Allocation Plans' are full of complex information which many people will find overwhelming and difficult to understand. This has lead to false rumour and almost panic about vast numbers of houses being built immediately throughout the town. A better network of public meetings with information coming from officers and/or elected members would have avoided this.

Representation ID: REP06142      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

A parish or town council would help in the process and as Garforth has neither it is vital that a Neighbourhood Forum is established. I would be pleased to be a member of such a forum.

Representation ID: REP06142      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

3.I support the aims of the Council as described in the introduction to the consultation documents and hope that our community can be protected from indiscriminate unnecessary development in the future.

---

**Name: Secretary Walton Parish Council**

**Representor No: PRS05506**

Representation ID: REP06145      Question Ref: H13

Housing

There is already a permanent Traveller site on Springs Lane, Walton. Whilst it is technically in North Yorkshire, it is only just within the NY area. Because of the proximity of the Travellers Site on Springs Lane, the Council does not believe another site should be considered in Walton Parish. Given the large quantity of houses proposed for Walton Parish in this Site Allocation Plan, it would be unacceptable to place further burden on this community.

Representation ID: REP06145      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Generally, the Parish Council supports the overall Site Allocation Plan and the process used for identification and allocation of sites, and the consultation process used to communicate the plan.



## General Comments

---

**Name: Sophie Hannibal**

**Representor No: PRS05509**

Representation ID: REP06150      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06150      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Julie Baker**

**Representor No: PRS05511**

Representation ID: REP06152      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06152      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: J.m Holmes**

**Representor No: PRS05512**

Representation ID: REP06153      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06153      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Dario Cossavella**

**Representor No: PRS05514**

Representation ID: REP06154      Question Ref: H7

Housing

We would like to support the campaign to save Hunger Hills and fields as we feel that there is enough development in the area and the need to keep green belt countryside. The addition development would bring further strain on our already stretched local amenities ie schools, doctors, social services and most important road and traffic structure which is now beyond breaking point in the area.

# General Comments

---

**Name: P.m Kemp**

**Representor No: PRS05515**

Representation ID: REP06156      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06156      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: J Dowding**

**Representor No: PRS05517**

Representation ID: REP06159      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06159      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Hilary Wild**

**Representor No: PRS05519**

Representation ID: REP06161      Question Ref: H7

Housing

I understand that Leeds City Council has identified the land surrounding Hunger Hills as unsuitable for development and I write to say that I agree with the initial proposal to leave Hunger Hills untouched. My reasons for this are that West End Lane is a very narrow and twisty lane and unsuitable for the volume of traffic using at the moment and it will be even worse and less safe if building takes place there and produces yet more traffic. Additionally, this area is a lung in the local district and the loss of this green space, together with the ecological impact on trees and wild life on the area would be disastrous. The woods are used for leisure by many people in the area and from out of the area and this facility must be retained.

---

**Name: L Abbey**

**Representor No: PRS05520**

Representation ID: REP06162      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06162      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Ann Abbey**

**Representor No: PRS05521**

Representation ID: REP06163      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06163      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Ian Wallace**

**Representor No: PRS05522**

Representation ID: REP06166      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06166      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: William Hunt**

**Representor No: PRS05523**

Representation ID: REP06167      Question Ref: H7

Housing

I welcome the proposal of Leeds Planning to leave the Hunger Hills area of Horsforth free from further development. I feel that any further development here would add to the already considerable urban spread which has come to characterise Horsforth and would also create further traffic problems for an area where the road infrastructure is already swamped by the quantity of traffic.

Hunger Hills is an area of considerable wildlife interest and, as a woodland area with footpaths and considerable vistas across the surrounding area resulting from the broad open spaces, it is also a vital amenity for people living in the closely populated district nearby, for whom access to open spaces must be regarded as an essential priority.

---

**Name: David Bath**

**Representor No: PRS05525**

Representation ID: REP06171      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06171      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Ann Dickinson**

**Representor No: PRS05526**

Representation ID: REP06172      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06172      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: L Evans**

**Representor No: PRS05529**

Representation ID: REP06173      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06173      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Gary Linsell**

**Representor No: PRS05532**

Representation ID: REP06180      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

The first time I heard about the above developments was on Sunday 28th July. I would hope that in the future, driven by the number of objections that you will receive that you will be more transparent and will put in place a more open dialogue to get peoples views on these proposals.

---

**Name: Matthew Woodruff**

**Representor No: PRS05536**

Representation ID: REP06184      Question Ref: H7

Housing

I am writing to express my support for the council officers' recent decision to identify the land surrounding Hunger Hills as unsuitable for development.

My family and I place huge value on this green area - it played an important part in our decision to move to Horsforth. It is invaluable for our wellbeing and those of many people we know because of its natural beauty and rural feel. Personally, I am a keen triathlete and regularly enjoy running in the area.

I also have concerns over the impact on wildlife and the environment - you just have to visit Hunger Hills woods in May when the bluebells are out to realise how special it is.

I hope the council will remain steadfast in its opposition to any development on this land.

---

**Name: Simon Croft**

**Representor No: PRS05538**

Representation ID: REP06188      Question Ref: H7

Housing

I refer to the recent consultation document the Leeds Site Allocation Plan: Volume 2 – 5 North. In particular the document refers to the site. We have considered the councils proposals and agree that the site should given the status of a 'site not considered suitable for allocation for housing'.

We consider that the site should not be developed for housing for the following reasons:

- The site is highly visible and is an important part of the local landscape.
- Development would significantly encroach upon the green belt.
- The Leeds Country way passes through the site and any development would have a detrimental effect on this important footpath.
- The site is remote from local facilities including shops and public transport and therefore is not sustainable.
- The surrounding roads are narrow and often, particularly at rush hour, congested. This would make access difficult.
- I regularly visit the site for recreation and its loss would have a detrimental affect on my leisure and well being.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Edmund Thornhill**

**Representor No: PRS05539**

Representation ID: REP06190      Question Ref: H4

Housing

5.21 Some of the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for future housing development as they are sites with issues which the Council does not have sufficient information to determine whether issues identified can be resolved.

5.22 However, there are amber sites where an issue, such as in the case of Calverley Cutting site where the Council suggest there may be access issues but there is a proven solution. The Council therefore has sufficient evidence that issues they have identified can be fully resolved or mitigated to an acceptable degree. On this basis, it is considered that sites should not be identified as amber solely because the Council has identified potential development constraints, due consideration should be given the ease of mitigating or resolving the issue/s identified.

See also representation submitted for full details

Representation ID: REP06646      Question Ref: H4

Housing

Site 1114

Some of the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for future housing development as they are sites with issues which the Council does not have sufficient information to determine whether issues identified can be resolved.

However, there are amber sites where an issue, such as in the case of Kirklees Knowl where the Council suggest there are highway issues to resolve where a known solution has been put forward. On this basis the Council have sufficient evidence to know any identified issues can be fully resolved or mitigated to an acceptable degree. It is therefore considered that sites should not be identified as amber solely because the Council has identified potential development constraints, due consideration should be given the ease of mitigating or resolving the issue identified and whether there is evidence to support this.

See representation submitted for full details

Representation ID: REP07481      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Some of the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for future housing development as they are sites with issues which the Council does not have sufficient information to determine whether issues identified can be resolved.

However, there are amber sites where an issue, such as in the case of Kirklees Knowl [1114] where the Council suggest there are highway issues to resolve where a known solution has been put forward. On this basis the Council have sufficient evidence to know any identified issues can be fully resolved or mitigated to an acceptable degree. It is therefore considered that sites should not be identified as amber solely because the Council has identified potential development constraints, due consideration should be given the ease of mitigating or resolving the issue identified and whether there is evidence to support this.

Representation ID: REP07666      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Some of the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for future housing development as they are sites with issues which the Council does not have sufficient information to determine whether issues identified can be resolved.

However, there are amber sites where an issue, such as in the case of Calverley Cutting site where the Council suggest there may be access issues but there is a proven solution. The Council therefore has sufficient evidence that issues they have identified can be fully resolved or mitigated to an acceptable degree. On this basis, it is considered that sites should not be identified as amber solely because the Council has identified potential development constraints, due consideration should be given the ease of mitigating or resolving the issue/s identified.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP07666      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

[Comments below relate to Outer West HMCA]

The Council state at paragraph 11.3.2 of the Outer West paper that planning permissions with units still remaining to be built as at 31st March 2012 have been deducted. It is questioned why, when the consultation document is dated June 2013, is the Council using planning permission data that is over a year old.

See rep for full details.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Edmund Thornhill**

**Representor No: PRS05539**

Representation ID: REP07666      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

[Comments below relate to Outer West HMCA]

Thirdly, the Council advise the supply figure will constantly change as planning permissions are granted, but they do not similarly acknowledge that some permissions will expire without being implemented due to issues with viability or other site development constraints. Again, there does not appear to have been any assessment undertaken of these sites, which form a critical part of the Council's supply, and which determine the number of new sites needed.

A site by site review is essential if the Site Allocations DPD is to be found sound as the current approach presents a high risk that insufficient sites will be identified to meet the housing needs of the District, resulting in the plan being ineffective.

The Council identify 48 sites which they state have planning permissions with units still remaining to be built as at 31/03/2012. Given the base date is over a year old it is likely that some of these permissions will have subsequently expired. In addition, as with the undeveloped allocations the Council are including within their supply, there is also evidence that some of the sites with planning permission are undeliverable.

To cite some examples, the outline scheme for 84 flats at Canal Wharf (site ref: 625) was approved on 17 May 2010 and therefore expired on 17 May 2013. This permission was not implemented. The Council has included a site at Wesfield Mill which had planning permission for 75 two bed flats. The permission expired on 3 March 2011 and whilst an application was submitted to extend the time limit for implementation, this was later withdrawn and therefore the site no longer benefits from planning permission for the 75 units identified. A site at Swinnow Row (ref: 26) is identified to have capacity for 67 dwellings, yet the most recent permission for the site is for 25 dwellings.

It is clear that if the Council proposes to reduce the number of new sites they need by relying on sites with planning permission or current undeveloped UDP allocations, they need to be certain these sites are deliverable and that they will deliver the number of units identified. The Council does not yet appear to have undertaken a detailed review of the deliverability of these sites. This is essential if the plan is to be effective, otherwise there is a significant risk the Council will identify too few sites to meet the identified need.

See rep for full details.

---

Representation ID: REP07666      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

[Comments below relate to Outer West HMCA]

12 of the sites (268 dwellings) are existing UDP allocations that have yet to be developed. Given the UDP was originally adopted in 2001, some 12 years ago, there has to be a detailed review of these particular sites to determine whether there is a realistic likelihood they will come forward for development given they haven't come forward in the lifetime of the UDP.

There is no evidence the Council has undertaken any such review of the undeveloped UDP allocations. Indeed, there are errors within this section, with Site 645 (Bagley Lane, Farsley) being shown as having capacity for 50 dwellings, when there is Reserved Matters approval for 45 dwellings. The site at Delph End in Pudsey (Ref: 646) is known to have ownership and access constraints and therefore it is not considered this site will deliver the 27 units identified by the Council.

This clearly demonstrates the need for a thorough review of the supply the Council is identifying given the deliverability of these sites is essential as this existing supply is being used to determine the number of new sites that will be required. If some of these sites do not deliver the number of dwellings expected, if any at all, but they are included in the Council's supply, this will result in insufficient new sites being identified to meet the requirement in this area.

See rep for full details.

---

**Name: Suzanne Mellor**

**Representor No: PRS05540**

Representation ID: REP06191      Question Ref: H7

Housing

with reference to recent consultation I strongly agree with your draft plan that all the fields around Hunger Hills are unsuitable for development. The area is of great value to the local community and very well used by many people. It provides a beautiful and diverse green area for both people and wildlife.

The Friends of Hunger Hills of which I am a member have worked extremely hard to make the area accessible to all and it would be devastating to lose it

---

**Name: Damian And Emma Mawer**

**Representor No: PRS05543**

Representation ID: REP06192      Question Ref: H7

Housing

My wife and I are writing to support the identification of the area in Horsforth ,designated Hunger Hills, as unsuitable for development in the Site Allocation Plan. This is a beautiful area of countryside which is highly valued by local people for recreation. It is rich in both history and wildlife, and is well cared for by a dedicated society. As well as affording fantastic views of Leeds and the Airedale valley, it is also very attractive when viewed on the approach to Horsforth.

We would again stress that to build on it would be totally inappropriate.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Sue Coatman**

**Representor No: PRS05547**

Representation ID: REP06194      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing to express my utmost concern at the possibility of any development on the fields around Hunger Hills, Horsforth or on the Billing. The Billing was left to the people of Horsforth and Rawdon specifically as a place of relaxation and natural tranquility and is a much used and valued area. Hunger hills is likewise a beautiful area much used and loved by local people.

In Horsforth, the infrastructure of roads, rail and schools is already overstretched and would not support any further development.

If either of these sites were developed in any way, this would diminish the areas concerned and the inhabitants, both now and in the future.

---

**Name: Elizabeth Talbot**

**Representor No: PRS05549**

Representation ID: REP06197      Question Ref: H12

Housing

I am also strongly opposed to any traveller site to be proposed for Garforth. There are no requirements for a local site to Garforth due to the planned extension to the Cottingly Springs site in Leeds. This should be sufficient for provision. I don't feel that any of the sites around Garforth are suitable for the needs of travellers.

---

**Name: Mandy Williamson**

**Representor No: PRS05556**

Representation ID: REP06205      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing to express my objection to the planning consent for East Ardsley.

I feel that this would compromise the services, including schools, transport and the medical centre (for which you already have a standard 2 ½ week wait to see a Doctor!).

I live on New Lane and cannot possibly see how this lane or the old lane (plate road) would cope with the extra traffic going on to Moor Knoll Lane or indeed Bradford Road by Country Baskets. Please reconsider these plans for the safety of the village.

---

**Name: E Ann Hopper**

**Representor No: PRS05569**

Representation ID: REP06219      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Finally, although I have restricted my objections and comments to the Adel area, I feel sure that similar objections must apply to several of the other proposed sites in Leeds where brownfield is still available.

---

**Name: Helen Terry**

**Representor No: PRS05588**

Representation ID: REP06247      Question Ref: H7

Housing

I am writing in connection with the above reference to the unsuitability for development of land on Hunger Hills woods and fields. Having moved to the area in the last few weeks we have been made aware of the decision to declare this area as unsuitable and would like to echo these sentiments. My husband and I moved here specifically for the benefits that this area brings and would pose strong objections to any developments that may have been suggested.

The area in question is a key factor in the desirability and pleasant surroundings of the immediate estate and wider area of Horsforth. It has long been recognised as a landmark in the area for its beauty and accessibility for residents and visitors. It brings a large amount of wildlife and nature to somewhere that is rapidly losing green and open spaces. We have regularly walked here and were very keen to live near this spot to be able to continue this in our leisure time. Since moving in we have seen how popular the woods and hills are and see a very large amount of our new neighbours also making use of this beautiful space.

I do not object to building in Horsforth as I think there is potential for further development to improve the community, but I think there are much more suitable sites on the outskirts that do not further impact the ever-increasing traffic and congestion within the centre. Road safety and traffic build up are factors that are already of concern to many residents and developing in this area would heighten these concerns dramatically. The infrastructure of the areas central to Horsforth struggles to cope with the demands that it currently faces, it would not be a prospect that I would relish to increase the traffic and number of cars trying to get through this area that would be as a result of the development of Hunger Hills.

I hope that you are able to maintain the position that you have taken to turn down applications for development here and are able to respect the strong views that residents hold in order to preserve this area.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Richard Terry**

**Representor No: PRS05590**

Representation ID: REP06249      Question Ref: H7

Housing

I am writing in connection with the above reference to the unsuitability for development of land on Hunger Hills woods and fields. Having moved to the area in the last few weeks we have been made aware of the decision to declare this area as unsuitable and would like to echo these sentiments. My wife and I moved here specifically for the benefits that this area brings and would pose strong objections to any developments that may have been suggested.

The area in question is a key factor in the desirability and pleasant surroundings of the immediate estate and wider area of Horsforth. It has long been recognised as a landmark in the area for its beauty and accessibility for residents and visitors. It brings a large amount of wildlife and nature to somewhere that is rapidly losing green and open spaces. We have regularly walked here and were very keen to live near this spot to be able to continue this in our leisure time. Since moving in we have seen how popular the woods and hills are and see a very large amount of our new neighbours also making use of this beautiful space.

I do not object to building in Horsforth as I think there is potential for further development to improve the community, but I think there are much more suitable sites on the outskirts that do not further impact the ever-increasing traffic and congestion within the centre. Road safety and traffic build up are factors that are already of concern to many residents and developing in this area would heighten these concerns dramatically. The infrastructure of the areas central to Horsforth struggles to cope with the demands that it currently faces, it would not be a prospect that I would relish to increase the traffic and number of cars trying to get through this area that would be as a result of the development of Hunger Hills.

I hope that you are able to maintain the position that you have taken to turn down applications for development here and are able to respect the strong views that residents hold in order to preserve this area.

---

**Name: Eamonn Darcy**

**Representor No: PRS05592**

Representation ID: REP06250      Question Ref: H7

Housing

I write to confirm my wholehearted agreement with Leeds City Council's recent decision to consider Site No. 1015 (details above) as not suitable for the allocation of housing. My reasons for same are, inter alia, as follows:

1. The presence of a wide variety of wild animal species, protected and otherwise, including bats, toads, frogs, hedgehogs, foxes, butterflies, moths, herons, owls etc. The presence of such wildlife and the environment in which they live are a major amenity for residents of Horsforth and beyond;
2. The presence of a wide variety of flowers, trees, hedgerows and bushes normally associated with more rural areas which also provide a major amenity for residents of Horsforth and beyond and
3. Increasing the density of housing in an already densely populated area with limited road access, declining levels of available spaces in local schools, increasing traffic congestion issues on nearby roads & highways as well as the increasing noise pollution from the nearby airport, all of which impair the quality of the local environment and neighbourhood and adversely impact on the environment of surrounding neighbourhoods also.



# General Comments

**Name: Cooke, The Singh Gill Family And Mr Walton**

**Representor No: PRS05614**

Representation ID: REP06261      Question Ref: H10

Housing

The site is located between Otley Road (A630) and Church/Eccup Lane (Appendix 1). The western boundary of the site is largely formed by a dense tree belt which measures approximately 20 metres in width. Beyond the woodland belt there are currently some small fields and then there is the A160 Otley Road. To the north of the site is an area of mature woodland in which Adel Beck is located to the north. The eastern boundary of the site is formed by woodland, Church Lane and a cluster of residential properties and agricultural buildings. The southern boundary of the site is bound by a hedgerow, hedgerow trees and wooden fence. The area of agricultural land to the south of the site is identified within the Leeds UDP as a Protected Area of Search. We understand that a planning application is to be submitted on this land shortly. The site is therefore bounded to one side by existing urban land uses and to all others by a belt of trees.

The development of the site would take design cues from the nearby residential development. It is proposed that the tree belt and hedges around the site are retained in order to screen the development within the locality and also maintain a natural buffer between the proposed built form and open agricultural land to the east of the site. It is proposed that areas of greenspace are integrated throughout the development to provide a graduation between the built up area and the agricultural land therefore ensuring that no harm is caused to the openness of the Green Belt.

An access road is proposed to be taken off of Otley Road, south of the agricultural holding. This stretch of Otley Road is relatively straight; as such no visibility issues are anticipated.

## Availability

The site is owned by Mr Cooke, the Singh Gill family and Mr Walton who all confirm that the site is available for development.

The land is therefore available for development.

## Achievable

This is a flat open greenfield site on the edge of the urban area of Leeds. It is therefore not contaminated and there are no topographical constraints. In recent years the site has been grazed and as such there is unlikely to be any ecological constraints which would preclude development.

The site can be accessed from either Otley Road or Church Lane. It is noted that an access from Otley Road would be more appropriate given the highway capacity concerns raised in respect of site 2130. Otley Road is long and straight with good visibility. Access is therefore capable of being achieved from Otley Road.

Part of the eastern fringe of the site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The proposed development would retain a buffer along the eastern boundary to ensure that the residential development would not have any impact upon the Flood Zones.

The SHLAA assessment for site 2130 sets out that this is a high market area and as such the site will be attractive to future occupiers and as such attractive to developers.

As far as we are aware there are no unusual or prohibitive development costs.

The development of the site is therefore undoubtedly achievable in that there are no known constraints to its prompt delivery and given that the site lies in a high market area it is clear that the site will be attractive to the house building industry and potential home owners.

## 1.Sustainable development

Otley Road is a subject to the national speed limit up to the Kingsley Drive T-junction.

Bus stops are located 115m west of the site along Otley Road providing frequent services to Ilkley, Otley, Skipton and Leeds City Centre. Clearly the site is within 400 metres of frequent bus services which provide access to jobs and services in other settlements.

Leeds City Council Highways (including Metro) have not assessed the site in terms of highways and accessibility. The assessment of site 2130 indicates that 50% of the site has access to shops and services. The site in question is located directly north of site 2130 and will have similar accessibility characteristics.

The site is well located in relation to shops, services, schools, outdoor leisure facilities, bus services and open space. The site is therefore located in a sustainable location.

## Green Belt

To check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

Along the western and northern boundary of the site are dense tree belts which create defensible boundaries. To the eastern boundary is a cluster of residential and agricultural properties which are accessed from Church Lane as well as a gappy hedgerow and hedgerow trees. The southern boundary adjoins a parcel of PAS land which is shortly to be the subject of a planning application. It is clear that the site has defensible boundaries on all sides and would become well connected to the urban area following the development of the PAS land site to the south. These natural and man-made features provide defensible boundaries to the site. The site is therefore well contained and will relate well to the existing urban area of Adel and the PAS land site. The natural features surrounding the site and the urban area therefore provide clear defensible boundaries which will prevent unrestricted sprawl into the Green Belt.

The allocation of the site in the Site Allocations DPD will therefore not harm this purpose of including land within the Green Belt.

To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

The site is located on the northern fringe of Adel. The nearest settlement is Bramhope approximately 1.6km north-west of the site. Between the two urban areas is Golden Acre Park which is identified as a City Park within the Leeds Open Space Sport and Recreation Assessment. It is clear

## General Comments

---

**Name: Cooke, The Singh Gill Family And Mr Walton**

**Representor No: PRS05614**

that this Green Belt buffer shall remain in situ and therefore maintain a permanent gap between the two urban areas. The development of the site will not reduce the gap and therefore it will retain an acceptable Green Belt buffer between the two urban areas. The development of the site will not therefore lead to the merging of two neighbouring settlements.

As the development of the site will not lead to a significant narrowing of the gap between Adel and Bramhope it will not harm the purpose of including land within the Green Belt.

To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

As set out above, the site has clear defensible boundaries to the adjoining Green Belt. These strong natural boundaries means that the development of the site will not lead to any encroachment into the Green Belt.

To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

It is our view that this pupose of the Green Belt is intended to apply for settlements such as York and not small parts of large scale urban areas or individual listed buildings.

Nothwithstanding that above, the most recent appraisal of the Adel-St Johns Conservation Area was undertaken by Leeds City Council in 2009. The Conservation Area boundary runs along the eastern edge of Church Lane up to Back Church Lane. The Conservation Area boundary is located 190 metres south of the site boundary. It is proposed that the existing trees and planting are retained along this boundary and that additional supplementary planting is located at this boundary in order to preserve the setting of the Conservation Area and listed buildings within.

The proposed development is set to the east of Otley Road beyond an exising tree belt. The visual impact of the development upon the settlement of Adel, when approached from the north, will be minimal. The incorporation of the site into the existing settlement of Adel and the preservation of the tree belts will not therefore harm the setting and special character of Adel, the Conservation Area or the listed buildings.

The development of the site will not therefore harm this purpose of including land within the Green Belt.

To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

Adel is an affluent residential area and therefore there is no derelict or other land in need of regeneration.

Nothwithstanding the above, we have already made reference to the housing need and it is clear that some greenfield and Green Belt land will need to be allocated for development. Therefore the purpose of including land within the Green Belt is not relevant.

The points set out above confirm that when assessed against the criteria of the NPPF that the land does not need to be kept permanently open. As the site does not perform an important Green Belt function there is no reason why the site could not be included within the settlement limits and should be allocated for residential development.

Flood Risk

The majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 1, residential development is therefore appropriate on the majority of the site. To the eastern fringe of the site there is a small area which lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3. It is proposed that the residential development will occur on the remainder of the site which lies within Flood Zone 1 and where development is acceptable. The eastern boundary of the site, which lies within Flood Zone 3 is to be retained as open space and would be utilised to enhance biodiversity.

As the majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 1, residential development is appropriate.

In summary, we have assessed the site in the context of its availability, achievability and suitability for housing development and as a result of this assessment we have shown that there are no technical or planning policy issues which would preclude the residential development of the site, that the site is sustainably located, it is well related to the settlement and its associated infrastructure and that the site lies in a high market area and therefore there is no reason why the site, if allocated, would not deliver housing promptly. Based on the assessment it is our view that the site should be allocated for residential development.

---

**Name: Derek Sharp**

**Representor No: PRS05620**

Representation ID: REP06278      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I wish to formally, and strongly object to the building of houses on the above greenfield sites for the following reasons:

1. The clear lack of public consultation. The effected residents have not been made aware of the proposed plans in any shape or form. I wonder how long the local councillors and MP have known about this and not brought it to the public's attention.

---

**Name: Janet Sharp**

**Representor No: PRS05622**

Representation ID: REP06281      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I wish to formally, and strongly object to the building of houses on the above greenfield sites for the following reasons:

1. The clear lack of public consultation. The effected residents have not been made aware of the proposed plans in any shape or form. I wonder how long the local councillors and MP have known about this and not brought it to the public's attention.

## General Comments

---

**Name: F A Sharp**

**Representor No: PRS05624**

Representation ID: REP06282      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I wish to formally, and strongly object to the building of houses on the above greenfield sites for the following reasons:  
The clear lack of public consultation. The effected residents have not been made aware of the proposed plans in any shape or form. I wonder how long the local councillors and MP have known about this and not brought it to the public's attention.

---

**Name: Karen Threlfall**

**Representor No: PRS05626**

Representation ID: REP06286      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I would like it to be noted that I am completely against any additional building in the area of Owlcotes in Pudsey. There are currently four developments within a very short distance of Owlcotes Road as you will know. The current developments are not even fully completed and already they are taking a toll on community facilities. Nursery's, Schools, Play areas, Doctors, Elderly care, Car Parking and Congestion. I can only imagine what further strains even more housing will bring, I understand the need for new housing but Pudsey is a small Town. People need fields and wooded areas to walk in and get some fresh air after a busy day, let children run and play and walk their dogs. There has to be enjoyment in life and for lots of people the green spaces we have are part of their recreation.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Barratt & David Wilson Homes Yorkshire West**

**Representor No: PRS05643**

Representation ID: REP06767      Question Ref: H11

Housing

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

Representation ID: REP06767      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy. There remain outstanding objections to the Core Strategy, of particular relevance are those relating to the overall quantum of housing requirement and the proposed distribution of the requirement. Our representations submitted on behalf of a consortium of house builders recommended that the overall housing requirement should be increased to conform with the Council's own SHMA evidence of housing need. Should the housing requirement increase, the Site Allocations DPD will obviously need to consider its initial appraisal of promoted sites in order to conform with the Core Strategy requirements.

Representation ID: REP07143      Question Ref: H11

Housing

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

Representation ID: REP07143      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.

Representation ID: REP07255      Question Ref: H11

Housing

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

Representation ID: REP07255      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.

Representation ID: REP07261      Question Ref: H11

Housing

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

Representation ID: REP07261      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Michael Johnson**

**Representor No: PRS05648**

Representation ID: REP06310      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Look slightly further afield --- Otley is a good example of a town needing regeneration but where there already is the infrastructure to support additional growth – schools, Hospital, supermarkets (Asda, Sainsbury, Waitrose) and a diversity of local shops, eateries, pubs, sports facilities. Suggest finally completing the outer Otley bypass down from the roundabout outside Otley across to meet the main Road from Otley to Pool in Wharfedale and then infill the substantial area between this new bypass road and the Otley town centre. That would work.

Representation ID: REP06310      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I have resided at [address given] for the past 60 years since a schoolboy of 12yrs old which should give me some credence at having seen in my lifetime Bramhope change from being a small village to the large village it is today. During that period a number of significant changes were made to the size of Bramhope by the building of the Parklands estate and the Long Meadows developments in particular plus a significant number of smaller infill housing developments. Whilst the village has grown well and prospered with a good solid community base, the backup facilities have lagged well behind the growth in population and are currently at their maximum capacity with little or no scope for future expansion to cope with present day numbers never mind the suggested increase in population.

My main objections to additional development in Bramhope are :

1. To increase the size of Bramhope by some 500 houses would require substantial extra local facilities which are unlikely to be forthcoming. For example we have a good Health Centre but constrained by inadequate parking facilities jointly shared with the local first school --- hemmed in by existing developments this cannot be increased in size to cope with additional requirements.
2. Local Shopping facilities are small in size (butcher/deli/bakery – all good for a small village but not offering the demands of an increased population). This means all the new houses would need cars (let's say 1000 extra vehicles) all to head off to Supermarkets in Otley, Headingley, Alwoodley, Moortown or Holt Park – the nearest smaller convenience store is the Co-op store on the main A660 at Adel which has extremely small and inadequate parking facilities. Bramhope village does not possess the space for convenience store infill meaning this traffic would either head off on the highly congested A660 road towards Headingley or on the inadequate and narrow country Kings Lane back road to Moortown. We have no post office, bank or garage all of which Bramhope once had.
3. The Local School at Bramhope would be inadequate to cope with the proposed rising population and has difficult access. Schoolchildren who then might have to be provided for outside the Bramhope village would need to be transported again increasing demands on the local traffic.
- 4 All proposed sites are in present day Green Belt and this distinction should be preserved for future generations – that was the whole point of Green Belts !!

Conclusion : LCC should think long and hard before effectively destroying the village of Bramhope with developments such as these. The strength of the United Kingdom rests on its diversity of Cities, Towns, Villages, Hamlets and Open Countryside and the correct mix is what needs to be achieved . This is not the first time LCC have been pressed by Government to increase its housing and has not always got it right. Get this right and you will preserve villages such as Bramhope and protect the environment for the foreseeable future. Get it wrong and the benefits of open green space will affect generations to come.

---

**Name: David Nagle**

**Representor No: PRS05660**

Representation ID: REP06319      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Hi,  
I would like to support this to.  
Kind regards  
David

LDF Site Allocations Plan Submission

In my ward of Rothwell we have three Neighbourhood Planning Forums which are doing an excellent job and I understand have submitted their own comments on the site allocations. The ward councillors have worked closely with the NFs on these and other related issues.

As a ward councillor I feel that each of these NPFs have given serious consideration to the issues in each respective area - the Carlton Neighbourhood Forum, the Rothwell Neighbourhood Forum and the Oulton and Woodlesford Neighbourhood Forum and I believe that they should have a strong influence and say on the site allocations.

I would therefore like to formally register that as an elected councillor for Rothwell (which also includes Carlton and Oulton and Woodlesford) that I fully support the comments submitted by our three neighbourhood forums and back them up fully.

Cllr Karen Bruce

# General Comments

Name: Newriver Retail Ltd

Representor No: PRS05670

Representation ID: REP06336      Question Ref: RVol1      Retail

The Council has acknowledged the difficulty of letting large units when they become vacant and highlighted concern that once these are subdivided, it is harder to create these units again which impacts on retailer interest. NewRiver Retail do not agree with the Council's proposal include a policy which protects large stores from being sub divided as it is too restrictive and does not provide enough flexibility to respond to market condition and may result in greater levels of vacancy. We therefore suggest that no such policy should be included in the Site Allocations Plan.

Representation ID: REP06336      Question Ref: R1      Retail

We have reviewed the proposed Bramley Town Centre boundary and the proposed Primary Shopping Area. The NPPF defines the Primary Shopping Area as "Defined area where retail development is concentrated (generally comprising the primary and those secondary frontages which are adjoining and closely related to the primary shopping frontage)". By this definition, we recommend the inclusion of a number of retail units to the Primary Shopping Area including Unit 45 (currently Teddy's Amusements), Unit 46 (currently Thorntons Fish and Chips) and Unit 2 (currently Farm Foods frozen foods). These units are clearly within an area where retailing is concentrated. We therefore consider that these units should be included in the Primary Shopping Area. The Bramley Town Centre boundary is currently very wide and encompasses a number of buildings which are not 'town centre uses' as defined by the NPPF. We consider that the town centre boundary should be more tightly drawn to reflect town centre uses and buildings. There we propose that the relatively recently developed warehousing unit off Waterloo Away should be excluded.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Persimmon Homes**

**Representor No: PRS05691**

Representation ID: REP06494      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Yes.

Representation ID: REP06494      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Whilst the Council has provided the results of its site assessment, we object to the overall approach on the following issues;

- ☐ Timescales of plan.
- ☐ What is being planned for?
- ☐ Approach to existing UDP allocations.
- ☐ Site assessment methodology.

See rep for full details.

Therefore, we would recommend the following:

- ☐ The plan period should be extended to at least 2032 to ensure there is a plan for 15 years.
- ☐ The Council should roll forward the housing shortfall from 2004-2012 into the first five years of the plan period, as well as adding an appropriate buffer from the later part of the plan period.
- ☐ The Framework suggests that to boost significantly the supply of housing and where there is a record of persistent under delivery of housing LPAs should increase the buffer by 20%. Therefore based on this evidence, there is a need to accommodate 920 dwellings per year from 2012/13 to 2016/17 on top of the household / population projections, which provides the baseline housing growth.
- ☐ Reassess all UDP allocations as part of the site selection process.
- ☐ Provide the site assessment methodology on how the Council has assessed a site.

Representation ID: REP06572      Question Ref: H4

Housing

Some of the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for future housing development as they are sites with issues which the Council does not have sufficient information to determine whether the issues identified can be resolved.

The boundary between sites 797 (allocation) and 1094A (red) follows the Green Belt boundary. This boundary was drawn in the late 1980's and was intended to indicate the line of the ELOR. However, the line was not based on any topographical or technical analysis and may or may not be practical or realistic. Reconciling the line of ELOR north of York Road, A64, with practical considerations has generated difficulties. It would be unacceptable to reinforce an historic, casual, line on a plan without proper analysis of design constraints south of A64 York Road. Until a studied alignment of the ELOR has been agreed it would be a mistake to continue the anachronistic boundary.

The eastern extent of the land to the south of Morwick Farm site allows flexibility in designing the alignment of the ELOR and has the potential to provide additional housing to the west of the future alignment.

See representation submitted for full details

Representation ID: REP06653      Question Ref: H7

Housing

No. Please see our other submission.

Representation ID: REP06784      Question Ref: H7

Housing

Yes.

Representation ID: REP06938      Question Ref: H7

Housing

No.

Representation ID: REP07514      Question Ref: H8

Housing

We disagree that the land to south of Morwick farm (part of Site 1094A) should be categorised as red. The case set out in relation to why this part of the site should be amber clearly demonstrates the site has potential for housing and why the Council need to take a more flexible approach to sites in this area given the routing of the East Leeds Orbital Road is not yet known.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Grantley Developments Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS05696**

Representation ID: REP06360      Question Ref: H10

Housing

The site to the north of 3111 has not previously been assessed by the Council. The site lies to the north of Site 3111 and would form a logical further phase of the development of sites 3112 and 3111.

The site is currently in the Green Belt, however we do not consider that it meets the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF. The site is well related to Garforth and has the potential to contribute to the Core Strategy housing requirements as part of an extension to a major settlement which cannot be met by existing allocations. Therefore, there are exceptional circumstances for releasing the site from the Green Belt.

Representation ID: REP06360      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

The Leeds Core Strategy, as submitted, proposes that 4,600 new dwellings be planned for in the Outer South East HMA for the period to 2028. Garforth is a major settlement in the Leeds South East Housing Market Area to which the majority of housing growth should be directed.

---

**Name: Philippa Simpson**

**Representor No: PRS05710**

Representation ID: REP06926      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Priority for new housing developments should be brownfield sites; which support regeneration of urban areas. Greenfield developments simply reduce the green areas, which play an important role in promoting health, happiness and well-being. A priority in allocating sites for large housing developments should be proximity to a railway station – sites should preferably be within reasonable walking distance of a station. If this is not possible then they should at least be on a high frequency bus route, which travels on a direct journey to a major transport interchange (bus service 16 does not meet this criteria as it takes an indirect route).

As an example the Bradford Road/Stanningley Road corridor appears to provide a good option for housing development. There are two railway stations within this corridor and the high frequency 72 bus provides a direct bus link between Leeds and Bradford. There are large supermarkets at Owlcoates and Swinnow with an Aldi supermarket under construction at Bramley Town End. It is also within relatively easy walking distance of S2 and local shopping centres. Substantial sections of the corridor are very rundown and new development would help support economic growth and deliver regeneration benefits. However it appears this area has either not been looked at or has been discounted for residential development.



# General Comments

**Name: Penny Mares**

**Representor No: PRS05717**

Representation ID: REP06469 Question Ref: H4

Housing

Site Ref 1095B: Old Pool Bank: no to amber  
Site Ref 1095C: Old Pool Bank: no to amber  
Site Ref 1095D: Old Pool Bank: no to amber  
Site Ref 1369: Old Pool Bank: no to amber.

Red would be the appropriate designation given the inappropriate scale of the combined sites in relation to the existing settlement, the infrastructure implications and developments elsewhere such as East of Otley, as this will add to pressure on both Pool and Otley services.

Representation ID: REP06478 Question Ref: H11

Housing

In general terms, housing development should prioritise brown sites located within the existing settlements of Otley and Yeadon before greenfield. We support the prioritising of brownfield sites that have had previous development and that lie close to existing dwellings

Representation ID: REP06481 Question Ref: General comment

Employment

No sites within Otley have been identified for employment development. This is a major issue if the town is to have a sustainable economy.

Representation ID: REP06483 Question Ref: General comment

Employment

We support the view that Ackroyd Mills could be allocated for employment use. The site is already in employment use and could be expanded.

Representation ID: REP06484 Question Ref: General comment

Employment

No sites within the boundary of Yeadon town centre have been identified for employment development. While there are extensive employment sites allocated close to the airport, Yeadon also needs employment land that will create job opportunities within the town's natural boundaries.

Representation ID: REP06485 Question Ref: E5

Employment

We note that Policy SP 12 indicates continued managed growth will be supported and this could include development in the proximity of the airport. In this context, we welcome the statement in the DPD that the airport could further enhance its employment role, but note the possibility of 'modest changes to green belt land'.

The DPD states any changes in this context should be set out in revisions to the Airport Master Plan, Surface Access Strategy, and an assessment of the economic value of the Airport to Leeds and the City Region. It refers to taking account of local impacts and a requirement for extensive dialogue with neighbouring communities, which we fully support. Any such revision and assessment process which results in allocation of development land should consider innovative ways of giving priority to employment opportunities for people from Yeadon and other Aireborough communities (rather than, for example, contractors from elsewhere who recruit elsewhere). The process should actively consider how to generate job opportunities for businesses in Yeadon and other Aireborough communities through infrastructure, transport links, etc, so Yeadon and other centres gain sustainable benefits from airport activity, passenger growth, and development in the vicinity, if this is inevitable. The process should also aim to minimise changes to green belt land.

Representation ID: REP06486 Question Ref: R1

Retail

This should be open to adjustment and final determination by the Neighbourhood Plan.

We do not support changing the town centre boundary to include site 320. This does not appear necessary for the proposed development and would potentially make the site suitable for locating a supermarket, which is not required as indicated in the LCC retail capacity study.

We would urge the inclusion in the town centre boundary of the triangle from Crossgate along Nelson Street and Walkergate to the Maypole, and either side of Boroughgate. There have been and are retail units along these streets which should be recognised as secondary frontage. If the Civic Centre is successfully refurbished as a vibrant community and cultural hub, these frontages in its vicinity will become more significant as retail opportunities in the town centre.

Representation ID: REP06765 Question Ref: G2

Greenspace

The application of notional standards to specific locations is a necessary exercise but it must take account of the specific ways in which greenspace is used in a particular locality and the initial broad brush approach cannot identify this accurately. The Neighbourhood Plans of Otley Town Council (OTC) and Aireborough Neighbourhood Forum (ANF) are better placed to interpret the standards and identify any appropriate changes in greenspace.

For example, a proportion of Otley's greenspaces – the riverside, Wharfemeadows Park, Chevin Park, railway footpath (677, 109, 83, 1027, etc) – are a key amenity for Leeds city residents. All city dwellers need leisure access to rural greenspace and this should be acknowledged, maintained and developed in the plan for and function of Otley's greenspace. The public transport links from Leeds to Otley are good, it is a 'Walkers are Welcome' town, and its greenspaces are one of the vital 'green lungs' for Leeds residents, contributing to health and wellbeing and leisure and recreation activities for city residents as well as the local population.

Representation ID: REP06788 Question Ref: G5

Greenspace

We understand that this can already be dealt with for individual cases through the planning application process as part of existing national policy. Any reallocation as proposed in G5 in Otley or Yeadon should be considered within the OTC or ANF Neighbourhood Plan

Representation ID: REP06790 Question Ref: G6

Greenspace

Yes

# General Comments

---

**Name: Penny Mares**

**Representor No: PRS05717**

Representation ID: REP06793      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Otley has a shortage of fully publicly accessible sports facilities and the local population would benefit greatly from a multifunction sports centre with external as well as internal sports spaces. The Plan process should ensure this and the related allocation of Community Infrastructure Levy funds can be considered through the Neighbourhood Plan process.

Representation ID: REP06796      Question Ref: General comment

Greenspace

Whilst the local Labour Party supports the idea of increasing the supply of housing and providing much needed homes within the Otley and Yeadon ward, especially affordable housing to rent as well as buy, this needs to be done in a way that is sympathetic to the views and needs of existing residents and sustainable. The provision of robust infrastructure is a necessary precondition for any major housing or employment development within the ward.

Outer North West

In Otley, for example, if there is to be major housing development to the East of Otley, this must be proportionate, phased, and conditional on a supply of genuinely affordable housing, delivery of the East of Otley Relief Road, an accompanying ban on through HGV traffic in the town centre, the provision of school places both at primary and secondary level, the incorporation of existing and possible new footpaths and sensitive landscaping to fully integrate the site with the town and mitigate the disbenefits for existing residents. Given the anticipated pressure on places, expansion of capacity at the town's existing primary schools should be considered.

Aireborough

Any development in the proximity of the airport, if it is inevitable, must be phased, with accompanying infrastructure that enables integration with the economy of Yeadon and other local communities, so these town centres can derive business and job opportunities from such expansion and not just the disbenefits of growing traffic congestion and loss of amenity.

---

**Name: Barratt & David Wilson Homes Yorkshire West & The Ramsden**

**Representor No: PRS05718**

Representation ID: REP06362      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

There remain outstanding objections to the Core Strategy, of particular relevance are those relating to the overall quantum of housing requirement and the proposed distribution of the requirement. Our representations submitted on behalf of a consortium of house builders recommended that the overall housing requirement should be increased to conform with the Council's own SHMA evidence of housing need. Should the housing requirement increase, the Site Allocations DPD will obviously need to consider its initial appraisal of promoted sites in order to conform with the Core Strategy requirements.

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage because we maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

See rep for full details.

---

**Name: Emma Grunwell**

**Representor No: PRS05723**

Representation ID: REP06396      Question Ref: H12

Housing

Absolutely no sites are suitable for travellers, and there is no need given the proposed extension of the site at Cottingley Springs which can more than accommodate the anticipated need.

---

**Name: Yvonne & Paul Searle**

**Representor No: PRS05726**

Representation ID: REP06395      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

If houses are going to be built they should use existing sites that are derelict e.g. the old Leeds Girls Grammar site in Headingley - it looks awful in its current state -. Also there are areas of Leeds, such as Clarence dock where half the apartments are EMPTY - it would be better to subsidise the rent/buying to enable residents to live there -again, an improvement to have a full and thriving community than a ghost town . These are only two examples...there will be LOTS of others known to the council where old sites can be built on, e.g. Otley Paper Mill site, preserving GREENBELT land. A previous suggestion was the conversion of an old church building in Headingley into private flats that Leeds Planning Dept opposed; a creative initiative was rejected, with ready access to jobs in the city, unlike in Bramhope.

# General Comments

**Name:** Lisa Mulherin

**Representor No:** PRS05734

Representation ID: REP06749      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Dear Steve,

I have to say that there was uproar at the Lofthouse PACT meeting on Monday night when a resident who attended both that meeting and my Advice Surgery asked what response I had had to the request to extend the deadline.

I believe that the scale of the proposed sites and volume of houses that would be generated around the 7 villages in my ward really does merit further consideration. Residents in Lofthouse, Robin Hood and West Ardsley have in large part only just become aware of the proposals this week to respond to the consultation. Even in the meeting on Monday night residents advised that they were not aware of the proposals. I have increasingly been getting emails in the last two days from people asking how and where the consultation was advertised and why they didn't know about it earlier in order to mobilise a response. The view from local communities in my ward is that the consultation has not been well advertised.

Best wishes,

Lisa Mulherin

Sent from my iPhone

On 22 Jul 2013, at 08:18, "Speak, Stephen" <Steve.Speak@leeds.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Cllr Mulherin

As Phil says we will be happy to meet to discuss concerns.

Meanwhile there are clearly many of your constituents who are aware of the consultation and I hope that they will take the opportunity to make their views known over the final week of the consultation period.

We have always been clear that the consultation is only an early stage of the site allocations process. Part of the reason for early consultation is that it provides the opportunity to identify and correct any obvious omissions or errors. It is important that we update our evidence base on sites across the district as we move forward, so that when we come to make the choices of which sites to allocate we are as confident as we can be that this is founded on accurate information.

If you would like to arrange a meeting with Lois and myself then please contact the office on the number below and we will sort out a convenient time.

Regards

Steve Speak

2478086

From: Crabtree, Philip

Sent: 22 July 2013 07:47

To: Gruen, Cllr Peter; Farrington, Martin

Cc: Mulherin, Cllr Lisa; Gowenlock, Philip; Speak, Stephen

Subject: RE: Site allocations consultation

Cllr Gruen

We will do as requested . I don't think we will be able to extend the timescale but we can work and meet Cr Mulherin about her and her constituents concerns

Phil

Phil Crabtree

Chief Planning Officer

The Leonardo Building

2 Rossington Street

Leeds City Council

LS2 8HD

Phone 0113 247 8177

Fax 0113 247 7748

From: Gruen, Cllr Peter

Sent: 22 July 2013 07:42

To: Crabtree, Philip; Farrington, Martin

Cc: Mulherin, Cllr Lisa; Gowenlock, Philip

Subject: Fwd: Site allocations consultation

Phil

As you know I am away now. Please consider request direct with Cllr M. If not material in terms of time scale, content for short extension- with publicity- listening Council etc.

Regs

PJG

Councillor Peter Gruen

Deputy Leader of Leeds City Council

Executive Board Member for Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support

Services

Civic Hall

Leeds

LS1 1UR

Tel: 247 4708

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Mulherin, Cllr Lisa" <Lisa.Mulherin@leeds.gov.uk>

Date: 21 July 2013 16:18:37 CEST

To: "Gruen, Cllr Peter" <Peter.Gruen@leeds.gov.uk>

Subject: Site allocations consultation

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Lisa Mulherin

**Representor No:** PRS05734

Dear Peter,

I was inundated with concerns about the Site Allocations process at my advice surgeries yesterday. As you know Ardsley & Robin Hood is one of the hardest hit wards in the city from the number of houses put forward to be allocated here.

We have had a heated public meeting last autumn relating to sites in E Ardsley and a drop-in session in East Ardsley to fully inform people of the sites and their categorisation. That session was well attended by residents from across E Ardsley and also by some residents from West Ardsley and Tingley. However the meeting was very difficult to attend from the other side of our ward in Lofthouse, Robin Hood and Ouzlewell Green. (I had sought a drop-in session there too but officers believed residents there should be encouraged to attend the Rothwell Drop-in session.) Lofthouse and Robin Hood are also subject to a number of sites that are categorised Green in the consultation document and which will significantly impact upon the existing communities and the already over stretched amenities in the area (inc schools and doctors surgeries.)

At my advice surgeries yesterday residents (primarily from Lofthouse and West Ardsley) argued that the consultation had been insufficiently advertised and they felt that it was being carried out "under the radar".

One resident in Lofthouse also complained that a significant site (marked 3085 on the map) was listed as his home address. Having trawled through background papers he found references to previous planning permission on the site which related to his garage! The explanation for the site's categorisation in the consultation document states that it is surrounded by development on three sides which residents quite rightly point out is simply not the case. I should add that I had strongly opposed development of this site in all of the meetings I attended prior to the site allocation plan going out to consultation. (I will make these points and others in a fuller formal response.)

Another man at the same surgery asked about alternative sites to 3085. He specifically asked why another site that he is aware of off the A642 in Rothwell adjoining an existing development was not colour coded at all. He advised that he knows the landowner there and that the owner had been "talking to planning for years" about the prospect of developing that site.

The long and the short of it was that residents in my ward felt that the site allocation plan consultation had come to their attention very late in the day. They feel they have not got enough time now to marshal a response from across their communities and in some cases they believe the plan drawn together is flawed (based on inaccurate information.)

From both ends of the ward yesterday they were seeking an extension of the consultation to offer a fuller response, to help to ensure that more of their neighbours were aware of the proposals and were encouraged to comment and to challenge some of the seeming inaccuracies in the plan put forward so that we reach a more sustainable plan that might command more public support moving forward.

I support their call to extend the consultation period and would be grateful if you would support it too.

Best wishes,

Lisa

Sent from my iPhone

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Lisa Mulherin

**Representor No:** PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

My ward of Ardsley & Robin Hood is comprised of most of the villages between the towns of Morley and Rothwell at the southern most point of the Leeds District. The villages are almost all historic industrial communities most of which were linked to coal mines with a lead works, brick works and rail industry which closed many years ago, but they remain quite distinct in identity and proud of their heritage.

In recent years there has already been considerable new build in across the ward, with Robin Hood, Thorpe and West Ardsley seeing the bulk of this. The new housing has almost all been sold on the basis of being commuter-belt with ease of access to the motorways being seen as an important selling point for developers. That has in turn taken its toll on the communities that have been host to the new housing with increasing pressure on decreasing amenities (shops, post offices, pubs have closed, doctors surgeries and schools are at capacity, bus routes have been cut and road networks are struggling to cope with the volume of additional traffic.) Promises of additional capacity adjacent to the Ardsley Sidings development (a GP surgery, dentists, children's day nursery and mini-supermarket) have not materialised due to the downturn in the economy, but the additional housing (over 400 houses in that immediate vicinity) still came.

It is understandable that set against this back drop local residents are deeply concerned about the scale of the site allocations being consulted upon in our area. There are 4924 houses across the green and amber sites in the three consultation documents relating to the Ardsley & Robin Hood ward. 2628 of these are in the Green Belt.

My constituents rightly feel that they have not had sufficient opportunity to consider and comment on the proposals in their area. As a ward Councillor I called for Drop-in consultation meetings at both sides of my ward. I was successful in winning the case to get a formal Drop-in consultation meeting in East Ardsley which served East Ardsley and Tingley well and which had some attendance from West Ardsley too. However my call to have a Drop-in event at the other side of my ward at Lofthouse or Robin Hood was turned down.

I and my ward colleague have taken copies of the consultation documents and feedback forms to Tenants and Residents Association meetings, Community Groups, PACT meetings, left copies in the Ardsley/Tingley Library and Lofthouse Community Centre. We have supported local residents who have drafted leaflets to deliver in their local area to draw people's attention to the consultation and the need to register their views. We advertised the Drop-in session in East Ardsley through local Church and community noticeboards, through the East Ardsley Primary School newsletter and St Michael's Church bulletin as well as a press release which was published in the Morley Observer. Despite all of this many residents are only learning of the proposals in their area very late in the day. For that reason I have called for an extension of the consultation to enable them to register their views.

As that extension has not been forthcoming, I wish to record my comments on the following sites in my ward and be clear that they primarily reflect the concerns that have been expressed to me by constituents in those areas.

A general observation I will make is that it seems unjust that so many large sites in Ardsley & Robin Hood have been subdivided (a prime example being site 1143) to make them seem more acceptable when large sites in neighbouring areas do not appear to have been treated in the same way. Subdividing sites does not reduce their overall impact when several of them are proposed for development. The cumulative impact of several medium size sites is just as harmful.

Representation ID: REP07269      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Additional Greenspace comments for the Outer South Area: Ardsley& Robin Hood is identified in the plan as being deficient in Parks and Gardens, Outdoor sports provision and Children and Young People's Play equipment. This part of my ward is particularly deficient in sports and play equipment for children and young people of 8 years and older. A site needs to be found to accommodate the needs of children and young people aged 8 upwards.A

---

**Name:** Thomas Forth

**Representor No:** PRS05750

Representation ID: REP06420      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I wanted to fill in your consultation for "Site Allocations Plan – Issues and Options" but when I came to the "Choose area" screen I had to pick a location. I don't want to give feedback on any particular area, I want to give feedback on the whole of Leeds and its city region. We need more housing. We need to overrule NIMBYs who want young people like me to pay them huge rents. We need to stop NIMBYs from denying us the same opportunities they had. I don't care where I live, so I can't give feedback on just a single area. I'll move to find somewhere affordable if I have to, I'd just like somewhere to live that I can afford. I completely trust Leeds city planners to draw up good plans if they stop listening to people who will always say "no" to any new building regardless of how good the plans are. I hope you can incorporate my comments in some way

---

**Name:** Jackie & John Mallinder

**Representor No:** PRS05756

Representation ID: REP06428      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

RE planning proposals for Abel Leeds 16 i wish to raise concerns over the plans, to turn Adel into a concrete.& housing night mare. build on brown field sites be for you start on the green belt.or is the proposals.cash driven only.

# General Comments

**Name:** Taylor Wimpey

**Representor No:** PRS05758

Representation ID: REP06414      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

There remain outstanding objections to the Core Strategy, of particular relevance are those relating to the overall quantum of housing requirement and the proposed distribution of the requirement. Our representations submitted on behalf of a consortium of house builders recommended that the overall housing requirement should be increased to conform with the Council's own SHMA evidence of housing need. Should the housing requirement increase, the Site Allocations DPD will obviously need to consider its initial appraisal of promoted sites in order to conform with the Core Strategy requirements.

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

See rep for full details.

# General Comments

Name: Taylor Wimpey

Representor No: PRS05758

Representation ID: REP06567 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

See full representation submitted

General Comments

3.1 Before dealing with the more detailed site specific comments, we have a number of general comments that are wholly relevant to the content and tenor of the consultation documentation. We acknowledge that while the Council has provided the results of site assessments, we have a number of concerns relating to the overall approach taken. These relate to the following areas:

- ☐ Timescales of the plan;
- ☐ The scope of the plan;
- ☐ Approach to existing UDP allocations; and
- ☐ The site assessment methodology.

Timescales of the Plan

3.2 The plan has identified 2028 as the end of the plan period.

3.3 We are concerned that, the Site Allocations DPD is unlikely to be adopted until around 2015 or 2016, and that is notwithstanding any potential delay that may arise from examination of the Core Strategy. There is therefore a significant risk that the site allocations plan will not be in place for a 15 year period, but only for a maximum of around 12 years.

3.4 Paragraph 157 of the NPPF is very clear regarding timescales for a planning document. Bullet point 2 states that plans should:

"be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon [emphasis added], take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date;"

3.5 The expectations regarding timescales are therefore clear and we are concerned that the allocations plan document will not meet this. While we acknowledge that it is a wider Core Strategy issue, timescales will nevertheless impact on preparation of the Site Allocations DPD.

Consequently, we would recommend that the timeframe for the plan is extended to at least 2032 to allow for preparation and on adoption, a 15 year plan to ensure that sufficient amount of land is allocated for development.

The scope of the plan

3.6 The Council states in its Site Allocations DPD summary that 66,000 (excluding windfall) is being planned for and that this has been "agreed". We are not aware of any agreement being reached. The fact that overall housing numbers are being challenged as a result of examination of the Core Strategy, would suggest that agreement has not in fact been reached. We comment further on housing numbers in the Outer Northwest housing Market Area later in this submission.

Approach to existing UDP allocations

We are concerned and disappointed that the Council has not reassessed the existing UDP allocations as part of the site allocations process. We comment separately on particular sites later in this submission, but if a site has not been delivered since the adoption of the UDP in 2001, a period of 12 years (which included the property boom up to around 2006/07), then the deliverability of allocated sites, and their appropriateness requires reconsideration.

3.8 Nonetheless, if only for consistency, the sites that have been identified in the UDP should be subject to review and reassessment, against the tests outlined in the NPPF. It is simply not reasonable or realistic to assume that UDP allocations will simply be carried forward without re assessment. It should also be acknowledged that a consequence of reassessment could be that some UDP allocations are not carried forward and therefore the Council should be identifying more (currently unallocated land) for development.

Site assessment methodology

3.9 There is a lack of transparency relating to how the Council has assessed and scored sites. No information has been made available during the process of how and why a site has been scored and ranked and how the basis upon which the Council has reached its conclusion.

3.10 In addition we are also concerned that sites have been assessed arbitrarily and little judgement has been applied as to whether sites should be grouped together or not. All of this results in a lack of transparency as to how sites have been assessed.

Initial Recommendations

3.11 In summary and based on the information above, we would recommend the following:

- ☐ The plan period should be extended to at least 2032 to ensure there is a plan for 15 years.
- ☐ Look again at what is being planned for in terms of overall housing numbers and the lack of agreement therein
- ☐ Reassess all UDP allocations as part of the site selection process.
- ☐ Provide the site assessment methodology on how the Council has assessed a site.

Green Sites

4.4 In the Outer North West HMA, the site allocations document sets out that land for 983 dwellings has been identified as light green in the consultation documentation. A numerical calculation shows that total of the housing target of 2,000 new dwellings land for a further 1,017 dwellings will need to be identified. If the requirement rises as a result of examination of the Core Strategy this requirement will nevertheless increase. We comment separately regarding the deliverability of some of the housing supply identified as green, but in the acknowledgement that further sites will need to be identified to meet the emerging housing requirement, there remains a considerable shortfall in potential provision.

Amber Sites

4.5 When accounting for the alternative sites identified as "amber" in the consultation documentation (sites 1002, 1080, 2130, 3367A, 3400), this suggests an additional potential provision of 491 dwellings. This results in a total potential provision (Green and Amber sites) of 1,474 additional dwellings. This remains insufficient to meet the requirement, by at least 526 dwellings.

4.6 When adding in Land West of Pool in Wharfedale - sites 1369, 1095C and 1095 D, (the sites identified as PAS in the UDP) this provides capacity for a further 231 dwellings. This reduces the shortfall to 295 dwellings. When accounting for site 1095B (the site identified as amber and within the Green Belt), this site could provide for a further 270 dwellings which still will not meet the draft housing target.

Overall

4.7 Overall it is clear that, even when bringing forward sites identified as amber in the assessment for development, meeting the draft housing target in the Outer North West Market Area is unlikely to be met. We consider that all sites identified as "amber" will be required in addition to the sites identified as "green" as a minimum in order to deliver the emerging housing target.

4.8 This comment however does not consider the deliverability of some of the sites identified within the consultation documentation, and we comment on this below, in particular land east of Otley.

Representation ID: REP07282 Question Ref: H11

Housing

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Taylor Wimpey**

**Representor No: PRS05758**

Representation ID: REP07282      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.

---

**Name: Redrow Homes**

**Representor No: PRS05770**

Representation ID: REP06754      Question Ref: H4

Housing

Some of the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for future housing development as they are sites with issues which the Council does not have sufficient information to determine whether they can be resolved.

However, there are amber sites where an issue, such as in the case of the land to the east of Rawdon where the Council suggest there may be access issues but there is a proven solution and as such the Council has sufficient evidence to know that issues they have identified can be fully resolved or mitigated to an acceptable degree. On this basis, it is considered that sites should not be identified as amber solely because the Council has identified potential development constraints. Due consideration should be given the ease of mitigating or resolving the issue/s identified.

See representation submitted for full details

Representation ID: REP07897      Question Ref: H7

Housing

Site 3326 - see submitted representation for full details

The land to the north of Bayton Lane, Rawdon (Site Ref: 3326) forms part of the wider land parcel at Cold Harbour Farm, which lies to the south of Bayton Lane. It is maintained the site should be considered as part of the Cold Harbour Farm site, but as a result of the presence of a Site of Ecological or Geological Interest (SEGI), this site is less suitable for comprehensive development than the land to the south of Bayton Lane. The site could deliver some dwellings to connect the development of the Cold Harbour Farm site with existing dwellings and built development to the north of Bayton Lane and east of Victoria Avenue (A658). This site should be identified for allocation alongside the Cold Harbour Farm site.

5.51 The Masterplan for the whole land parcel identifies site 3326 as an area of Common Land with no development proposed. At the very least the site should be incorporated into the Cold Harbour Farm site to support the delivery of this area of open space as part of the wider development.

However, it is maintained the site could sustain some development, which would form a natural extension to the built development to the west and the development proposed as part of the Cold Harbour farm site.

5.52 In the context of the site containing a SEGI, it is considered appropriate to colour code this site amber, as it is a site which has potential, but where there may be issues to resolve.

---

**Name: Redrow Homes**

**Representor No: PRS05772**

Representation ID: REP07319      Question Ref: H11

Housing

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

Representation ID: REP07319      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.



# General Comments

**Name:** Linda Woolley

**Representor No:** PRS05794

Representation ID: REP06487      Question Ref: H12

Housing

[Comment removed]

Representation ID: REP06487      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

My general comments are that the plans are not feasible. There are inadequate facilities. We regularly suffer from flooding and transportation is a nightmare. The roads will not be able to cope, they can't cope now. We have already felt the effect of new houses nearby on Garforth Cliff as we as local residents have to deal with this on a daily basis. This includes transport, flooding, road surfacing. Stop doing stuff for money and think of the impact on residents and the local community.

# General Comments

**Name: KUC Properties**

**Representor No: PRS05795**

Representation ID: REP06491      Question Ref: R4

Retail

KUC propose that the MIAMI site is allocated to meet Garforth's convenience retail needs.

## Sustainability and Availability

The site covers an area of 2.7hectares and is located on Aberford Road, Garforth, with access presently taken from both Lotherton Way and Fusion Point. The site is vacant and therefore can be considered as being immediately available.

The site could comfortably accommodate a food superstore of around 60,000sqft gross/30,000sqft net (5,574sqm gross/2,787sqm net) floorspace, with associated car parking and a petrol filling station. The layout has been prepared following discussions with a number of interested operators and strong commercial demand had been expressed for a food store on this site. In addition to the site being available, a foodstore scheme is also therefore deliverable in the short term.

As set out above, the Council's latest retail study (July 2011) concluded that, if Garforth is to accommodate the planned significant housing growth (of between 2,000 and 3,500 home being planned), then it would be sustainable to improve the convenience shopping offer of the town. Whilst the study also notes that as a result of limited opportunities for town centre development, it will be necessary to investigate edge of centre opportunities, the only such opportunity is the Town End Site. As set out above, this site is not suitable to accommodate a large foodstore, which would improve the convenience retail offer of Garforth and, in particular, provide additional choice and competition to Tesco in meeting the main/weekly food shopping needs of residents

Whilst the emerging local Plan Core Strategy acknowledges that there may be a need to review Green Belt boundaries around Garforth, the primary aim of this is to accommodate forecast housing growth. It is considered that the MIAMI site is much more sustainable, given that:

- The site is previously developed;
- It falls within an area of established commercial activity;
- It is also close to public transport provision, including bus stops and a railway station;
- The site lies within easy walking distance of a significant number of residential properties; and
- Its development would remove the need to develop previously undeveloped, Green Belt land, in order to meet Garforth's future shopping needs.

In relation to highways issues, the introduction of a new signalised junction into the site from Aberford Road, supported by a dedicated right turn lane, would help to provide sufficient capacity on the local highway network to safely accommodate a foodstore proposal of the size indicated. Furthermore, access for service (i.e. delivery) vehicles can be safely accommodated using the access to rear (east) of the site, via fusion Point, which is existing, and purpose built to accommodate HGV movements.

## Employment Lane Issues

There should be no overriding requirement to retain this site in traditional employment use. In recent years, the site has suffered from long periods of vacancy, with any occupancy of the building being only on short term, low rent tenancies. Advice from commercial agents indicates that the constrained nature of the premises do not meet with the requirements of potential higher value tenants, who would be prepared to enter into a long term commitment to the building. There is therefore no prospect of achieving any commercial viable long-term occupation of the premises by a single tenant. The NPPF advises that the planning policies should avoid the long terms protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose.

The NPPF also recognises retail use as a form of economic development. In this context, it is estimated that a new foodstore of around 60,000sqft gross/30,000sqft net (5,574sqm gross/2,787sqm net) would create around 250 new jobs. This is in contrast to the absence of any employment at all being supported by the site at present. These new jobs would be accessible and attainable to the local population, particularly given the nature of retail employment, which offers opportunities for part time working, along with training and skills development.

In any event, the Outer East area of Leeds, within which Garforth falls, is identified in the 2010 City-wide Employment land Review as having a considerable over supply of industrial and warehousing land and premises, relative to forecast need throughout the emerging plan period. The development of the site for a food store would not therefore have any adverse impact upon the supply for more traditional employment uses (i.e. within Class B1, B2 and B8) in this part of the City

Also see representation submitted for full details. No site plan supplied.

# General Comments

**Name: KUC Properties**

**Representor No: PRS05795**

Representation ID: REP06491      Question Ref: General comment

Retail

Food shopping patterns in Garforth are currently dominated by the existing Tesco store, which comprises 2,300sqm net sales, and is also accessed from Aberford Road. Whilst this store trades well, it is relatively small in size, particularly in comparison to other existing stores in the wider area. In this context, and given the monopolistic position which Tesco currently enjoys, a significant proportion of locally generated convenience goods (i.e. food) spending leaks out to these large stores.

Such store stores include Sainsbury's at Colton, Morrisons in Rothwell, Asda at Glasshoughton and Killingbeck and Tesco Extra at Seacroft – all of which are currently performing strongly. Recent telephone shopping surveys undertaken on behalf of KUC indicate that over half of food spending originating in the Garforth/Kippax area is spent at these and other stores, located outside of this area. This is, therefore, capacity to support new foodstore development in Garforth by clawing back this leakage of spending out of the local area.

Against the above background, there is clearly an important and indeed pressing need to provide a second store capable of meeting main/weekly food shopping needs in Garforth. This would provide additional choice and competition to the existing Tesco store and, in doing so, help reduce the need to travel outside of the area to meet these needs – delivering significant sustainability benefits. Such a store would complement, rather than compete with, existing facilities in Garforth Town Centre, including the Sainsbury's Local and Co-op convenience stores, which are of a much smaller scale, and therefore focused upon meeting top-up and more specialist needs.

The need for enhancing convenience retail provision in Garforth is also recognised by the Leeds City Centre, Town and Local Centres study published by the City Council in July 2011. This concluded that, if Garforth was to accommodate significant housing growth (as is planned in the emerging Core Strategy), then it would be consistent with the principles of sustainability to improve the convenience shopping offer to the town. As set out further below, the MIAMI site is considered to be the most suitable opportunity to achieve this.

Also see representation submitted for full details

Representation ID: REP07844      Question Ref: H10

Housing

MIAMI warehouse site on Aberford Road in Garforth

Representation ID: REP07886      Question Ref: R3

Retail

The site covers an area of 2.7 hectares and is located on Aberford Road, Garforth, with access presently taken from both Lotherton Way and Fusion Point. See submitted representation for full details.

The Issues and Options document for the Outer South East area (which includes Garforth), identifies that two sites were submitted as part of the previous 'Call for Sites' consultation for inclusion within the Site Allocations Plan in Garforth for retail and employment uses. These include land at the junction of Barrowby Lane and Wakefield Road, Town End, Garforth, proposed for retail development, as well as a wider site to the west of this, also between Barrowby Lane and Wakefield Road, which is proposed for mixed use development, also including a retail component. Land at Junction of Barrowby Lane and Wakefield Road, Town End  
Whilst the first of these two sites lies within the existing development boundary for Garforth, it is small in size (around 0.5 ha), and could not accommodate a new large foodstore which meets the important needs.

It is also subject to other constraints which could impact upon its ability to accommodate new retail development in the short term. Given its proximity to the existing Main Street/Aberford Road/Wakefield Road/Barrowby Lane junction, it would be necessary to use adjoining land in order to provide a satisfactory vehicular access into the site. It would also be necessary to provide new pedestrian links to the existing town centre, which overcome the barrier to movement represented by the above junction. Finally, the irregular shape of the site will also impact upon the physical form of development possible.

Land off Wakefield Road

The wider adjoining land to the west is part of the Leeds Green Belt, and is considered wholly inappropriate for any form of development (including retail), for the following reasons:

- the site performs an important strategic function separating Garforth from the main built up areas of Leeds. Development of this site would not result in new robust and defensible future Green Belt boundaries being set, particularly to the south, and therefore would set a precedent for further unrestricted sprawl in the future.

Development of this site therefore risks the coalescence of Garforth with the main urban area of Leeds;

- the site accommodates important farm land, some of which is identified as Grade 2 agricultural land and therefore forming part of best and most versatile agricultural land.

The NPPF advises against the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, wherever possible; and

- West Garforth has longstanding flooding and drainage issues. The development of this land has the potential to exacerbate this problem, resulting in greater levels of surface water run-off from the site.

Whilst there is an acknowledgement in the emerging Local Plan Core Strategy that there may be a need to review Green Belt boundaries around Garforth to accommodate the forecast housing growth, there is no such justification in respect of meeting retail needs. This is because the MIAMI site, on Aberford Road, is a previously developed site which is suitable and available to accommodate a new large foodstore, as explained further below.

# General Comments

**Name: KUC Properties**

**Representor No: PRS05795**

Representation ID: REP07886      Question Ref: R4

Retail

See submitted representation for full details

KUC propose that the MIAMI site, as illustrated on Lister Associates Drg. No. B865-01A, attached to this letter, is allocated to meet Garforth's convenience retail needs.

## Suitability and Availability

The site covers an area of 2.7 hectares and is located on Aberford Road, Garforth, with access presently taken from both Lotherton Way and Fusion Point. The site is vacant and therefore can be considered as being immediately available.

The site could comfortably accommodate a food superstore of around 60,000 sqft gross/30,000 sqft net (5,574 sqm gross/2,787 sqm net) floorspace, with associated car parking and a petrol filling station.

It is considered that the MIAMI warehouse site in Garforth represents an opportunity to meet Garforth's future convenience retail needs, as recognised by the City Council in the 2011 City Centre, Town and Local Centres study. The site has a long history of either vacancy, or limited short term tenancies, and is unlikely to be a viable employment location in the long term, particularly given the level of supply of other sites and premises elsewhere in this part of Leeds.

It is clear that there are no sites with or on the edge of Garforth Town Centre which could meet the same need - which is for a new large foodstore providing additional choice and competition, and reducing the need to travel to large stores outside of the local area. This site is located with the existing urban area, conveniently accessible from existing residential properties, and therefore represents an ideal opportunity to meet this need without encroaching onto an area of Green Belt land that, for the reasons identified above, is wholly unsuitable for development. The MIAMI site is also currently vacant, and therefore available in the short term and commercially deliverable, given the interest expressed from foodstore operators.

On this basis, we would request that the proposed extension of Garforth Town Centre into the Green Belt is removed from the Site Allocations Plan and instead the MIAMI site be identified in the plan as an appropriate location to address the acknowledged need for improved convenience retail provision in Garforth.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the MIAMI site further with the Council. In the meantime, however, please let me know should you have any other queries at all.

Representation ID: REP07886      Question Ref: R4

Retail

See submitted representation for full details

KUC propose that the MIAMI site, as illustrated on Lister Associates Drg. No. B865-01A, attached to this letter, is allocated to meet Garforth's convenience retail needs.

## Suitability and Availability

The site covers an area of 2.7 hectares and is located on Aberford Road, Garforth, with access presently taken from both Lotherton Way and Fusion Point. The site is vacant and therefore can be considered as being immediately available.

The site could comfortably accommodate a food superstore of around 60,000 sqft gross/30,000 sqft net (5,574 sqm gross/2,787 sqm net) floorspace, with associated car parking and a petrol filling station.

It is considered that the MIAMI warehouse site in Garforth represents an opportunity to meet Garforth's future convenience retail needs, as recognised by the City Council in the 2011 City Centre, Town and Local Centres study. The site has a long history of either vacancy, or limited short term tenancies, and is unlikely to be a viable employment location in the long term, particularly given the level of supply of other sites and premises elsewhere in this part of Leeds.

It is clear that there are no sites with or on the edge of Garforth Town Centre which could meet the same need - which is for a new large foodstore providing additional choice and competition, and reducing the need to travel to large stores outside of the local area. This site is located with the existing urban area, conveniently accessible from existing residential properties, and therefore represents an ideal opportunity to meet this need without encroaching onto an area of Green Belt land that, for the reasons identified above, is wholly unsuitable for development. The MIAMI site is also currently vacant, and therefore available in the short term and commercially deliverable, given the interest expressed from foodstore operators.

On this basis, we would request that the proposed extension of Garforth Town Centre into the Green Belt is removed from the Site Allocations Plan and instead the MIAMI site be identified in the plan as an appropriate location to address the acknowledged need for improved convenience retail provision in Garforth.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the MIAMI site further with the Council. In the meantime, however, please let me know should you have any other queries at all.

# General Comments

Name: Katie Elmore

Representor No: PRS05801

Representation ID: REP06497      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing to you to object strongly to the permission of houses being built in and around Rawdon. Many other people have objected and are objecting to the planning and building of these new houses, so I am speaking on behalf of many other people in the community. I believe that Rawdon, being a small and peaceful village, should be able to take pride and strength in knowing that we can have our say in protecting our home, no matter how small we may be. Even if we seem small on the outside, the power and hope in the community spirit is enough to speak out for itself and prove that we are strong faithful inside. I think that is a hard thing to find but wonderful thing to have, and that will make us keep fighting for what we think is right and what we believe in. We believe in a rural Rawdon. There are also many reasons why the planning shouldn't and can't go on:

The one main road going past Rawdon (A65) is already terribly busy with Leeds and Bradford rush hour traffic, making a long and time consuming journey to go anywhere. There will also be an absolutely ridiculous 6,000 additional cars on the already extremely busy road, if the building goes ahead.

The building of these houses will also put an enormous amount of pressure on local medical services, dental practices, and schools. This added pressure may force the residents to move, as the local services will be full from the terrible amount of new houses, meaning the houses of Rawdon will stand empty, gaining uselessness, problems and age. There are also not many schools in the area, and the building of the new houses will put a terrible amount of extra pressure on those facilities.

There will also be no point building new houses, as the houses recently built on High Royds in Menston are hardly inhabited or lived in. Those houses should be inhabited, so instead of ruining another plot of land, the houses could be used, and the council could save money by not spending on new houses and gaining money from potential and definite buyers at High Royds.

The building work will also scare away and kill rare wildlife that call Rawdon their home, not to mention the other animals that are already living in those fields that are going to be built on, such as cows horses, chickens and sheep. There are also farmers working on those fields growing and producing vital products to sell. Also, the money raising, charity events that make the community a happier place, take place every year in those fields and are the centre of joy in the local Rawdon area.

The building of the new houses will also disturb the community, as the building work will make much noise as the new houses are planning to be built next to the residents of Rawdon. The noise will also be so much louder because of the ridiculous amount of new houses being built are going to be so crammed in the noise will be even greater, causing more disruption, leading onto even more objections.

Please take all of these points into consideration, and not just dismiss them straight away, as they may lead to your benefits as much as ours. I am sure you are very keen to build on these plots of land, but Rawdon is ours as much as yours.

Please don't ruin Rawdon.

# General Comments

**Name:** White

**Representor No:** PRS05818

Representation ID: REP06521      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Land at Spring Lea Farm, Troydale, Pudsey, LS28  
CALL FOR SITES FORM (See site plan on representation)  
(Please refer to the other response already submitted relating to this site.)

The site is not already a SHLAA site submission.  
Submitted by site owner (via agent)

Northing 432 754  
Easting 423 758

Gross hectares 10.5  
Surrounding uses: residential, commercial/industrial, fields, woodland.

No planning applications been made for new uses in the last 5 years.  
Proposed for residential (houses) circa 265.

There are no aboricultural or physical constraints; there are no known flood risk issues. The site has a road frontage onto Troydale Lane and subject to detailed design parameters an appropriate access can be achieved. A more detailed assessment of constraints and opportunities will be carried out in association with a selected developer via the preparation of master plan proposals involving a team of consultants. No legal, tenancy or ownership constraints exist that we are currently aware of.

Expected planning permission (outline) 2017/18.  
Commencement on site 2019/20  
Completion 2024.  
Approximately 25 completions in year 1, years 2 to 5 completions @60 per annum.

This document has been prepared to demonstrate the suitability of the site at Spring Lea Farm, Troydale for removal from the green belt and allocation for housing through the Leeds Local Development Framework process. The site has not been included in the 2013 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) therefore this document provides further information which can be used to assess the site with the intention of including the site in the 2014 SHLAA review.

The site is located to the north of Troydale Lane, Pudsey and is approximately 2km to the south east of Pudsey town centre. It is approximately 7km to the west of Leeds city centre and 8km to the east of Bradford city centre. The site extends to approximately 10.5ha and the majority of the site comprises of fields with a number of greenhouses and rhubarb sheds on the site.

The surrounding land uses are mixed. Immediately to the south of the site is residential development. This is the Barratt Homes development, Troydale Park, of approximately 42 dwellings, constructed within the past 5 years on the former Troydale Mills site. There is also commercial and industrial development on Troydale Lane to the south. To the east is woodland which forms part of Pudsey Beck Woods.

There is a bus stop to the south of the site on Troydale Lane where the 62A bus services from Pudsey to Seacroft via Leeds city centre and Cross Green can be accessed every hour. The 90 bus service from Leeds city centre to Greengates via Troydale and Pudsey provides an evening service. The 709 bus service travels to Troydale from Bradford, Thornbury and Pudsey. The site is approximately 3km from Bramley railway station, which has regular trains to Leeds, Bradford, Halifax and Manchester. Suitable vehicular access to the site can be provided from Troydale Lane where there is a frontage onto the adopted highway. The site is approximately 800m from Tong Road, where further bus services can be accessed including the 205 bus service from Dewsbury to Pudsey via Morley.

The site has good access to local schools; Cranshaw secondary school is approximately 2km away on Robin Lane and Lowtown primary school is approximately 1.7km from the site. There are existing retail and leisure facilities in Pudsey and Bramley town centres, including supermarkets and industrial areas close by in Stanningley. The site would provide a sustainable extension to Troydale where new residents would be able to access employment, retail and leisure opportunities in both Leeds and Bradford.

The site is close to 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 realise 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 foot, cycle, rail and road access, improvements to green infrastructure, and increased business competitiveness and growth. The development of this site would provide investment in the area; deliver a proportion of affordable housing and new greenspace.

# General Comments

---

**Name: White**

**Representor No: PRS05818**

Troydale is a small village in the villages and rural category of the proposed settlement hierarchy contained in the Submission draft Core Strategy. However it is very close to the Leeds Main Urban Area (MUA) at Pudsey. SHLAA site submissions 3050 and 1184 are given a 'Green' status by the City Council in the initial Site Allocations Plan.

The site has well defined, defensible boundaries so the development of the site would not lead to unrestricted sprawl or ribbon development. Natural and physical features provide a good existing barrier with woodland to the east and roads to the south and a tree and hedge line to the west/north west.

Consequently the subject site exhibits significant visual and physical containment and new long term defensible Green Belt boundaries can be clearly defined. The site currently has some development on it which reduces the key Green Belt attribute of openness. The visual containment of the site and its close association with development in Troydale add to the case for removal from the Green Belt. Access to the open countryside can be retained and enhanced.

The development of this land either on its own in association with the settlement of Troydale or in association with the 'Green' rated sites to the west can be achieved via good master planning and urban design so that urban sprawl and the coalescence of towns is avoided.

[see representation for site plan / graphics / photos]

Representation ID: REP06521      Question Ref: H11

Housing

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations

Representation ID: REP06521      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.

Representation ID: REP06521      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.

# General Comments

---

**Name: William Elmore**

**Representor No: PRS05819**

Representation ID: REP06522      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Sites 3331, 4095 & 3329 - Green to Red

I am writing to address you about the development of houses which could be built on Rawdon's land. This debate has been going on for months and the majority of people who live in Rawdon will object to any building whether it is houses, offices, factories or much else. To start with, the traffic going into Leeds or Bradford is already horrendous. You cannot expect to set off to work and not get stuck in traffic for some of your journey. Imagine if potentially there were 6000 more cars on the road, with the extra addition of houses on the old Sandoz sight, (which will be built in due course). Travelling will be atrocious, even the buses and trains will be worse.

Secondly, the house prices will fall, and when they do, many bad consequences follow; public anger, reversing national economy, and another credit crunch, which drastically affects businesses and people's attitude to spending.

My third point is nature. You may have seen on the RSPB adverts and their slogan "If there is no home for nature, there will be no nature." Wildlife in Rawdon will shrink and Rawdon will not be noted a peaceful, tranquil, suburban environment, it will be an urban busy place with very little/no greenery.

My fourth and final point is the 2 main schools in Rawdon and Horsforth - Benton Park and Horsforth School. These schools are already near to their maximum capacity. If the 3000 houses are built at least 2000 children will have to go to these schools (as some might go to catholic schools, others independent schools or some other families may not have children). This will put huge pressure on the 2 schools and some children will have to go to other schools because they are at maximum capacity. They may also struggle to get in to other, 2nd choice schools because they are not in their catchment area.

Please leave Rawdon the way it is and before you even consider building in Rawdon, take note of the absolute failure of the High Royds project in Menston.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and we do hope you take into consideration all of our points, these may not just benefit us, but may prove to you this building is not as great as it is made out to be.

---

**Name: Michael Dunk**

**Representor No: PRS05821**

Representation ID: REP06524      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06524      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06526      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06526      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf



# General Comments

---

**Name: Paul Griffiths**

**Representor No: PRS05822**

Representation ID: REP06527      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06527      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Susan Eklof**

**Representor No: PRS05825**

Representation ID: REP06531      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06531      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Margaret Chatterton**

**Representor No: PRS05826**

Representation ID: REP06532      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06532      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Dorothy Longden**

**Representor No: PRS05827**

Representation ID: REP06533      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP06533      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

# General Comments

---

**Name: S Fawcett**

**Representor No: PRS05828**

Representation ID: REP06535      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06535      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: G Hewitt**

**Representor No: PRS05829**

Representation ID: REP06536      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06536      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Janet Wilson**

**Representor No: PRS05831**

Representation ID: REP06537      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06537      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

## General Comments

---

**Name: P Cruckshank**

**Representor No: PRS05832**

Representation ID: REP06538      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP06538      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP07044      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP07044      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: The Sir Robert Ogden Partnership Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS05834**

Representation ID: REP06542      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Site 2127

We do not agree that all of the sites that have been identified in the Outer South West area are the most suitable sites to consider allocating for future housing development. In particular there are sites to the north and south of West Ardsley which lie within the Green Belt which are not deemed to be the most suitable sites for allocation.

See also representation submitted for full details

# General Comments

**Name: David Thomson**

**Representor No: PRS05838**

Representation ID: REP06530      Question Ref: H10      Housing

There are no other sites left in Boston Spa with expanding the village envelope.

Representation ID: REP06530      Question Ref: H12      Housing

We would not support the allocation of any Gypsy or other traveller's site in Boston Spa or in the wider ONE area. We consider that such sites should be within or immediately adjacent to the main urban areas and on brown field sites close to existing services and facilities. It must also be remembered that there is an existing site at Springs Lane which serves this area.

Representation ID: REP06530      Question Ref: H13      Housing

No

Representation ID: REP06530      Question Ref: H14      Housing

We would support the provision of housing specifically for the elderly as long as the developments were within the village envelope and adjacent to the support facilities needed for such housing. If Sites 1154 and 3132 cannot be retained as green space or playing fields they could in whole, or in part, be appropriate and suitable for specific elderly accommodation as they are relatively close to the village centre and its facilities.

Representation ID: REP06530      Question Ref: H15      Housing

We would support the provision of housing specifically for the elderly as long as the developments were within the village envelope and adjacent to the support facilities needed for such housing. If Sites 1154 and 3132 cannot be retained as green space or playing fields they could in whole, or in part, be appropriate and suitable for specific elderly accommodation as they are relatively close to the village centre and its facilities.

Representation ID: REP06530      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

The Issues and Options report refers to an overall increase of circa 8% in the housing numbers for the ONE area. The Core Strategy states that the apportionment over the area should be determined by the settlement classification and Boston Spa is now a "smaller settlement" so should only be required to accept a lower proportional increase in housing numbers. The village currently has 1866 dwellings so an average increase over the plan life would be 149 and this should be reduced due to the settlement classification. An added complication is that Boston Spa already has extant planning approvals for 207 dwellings which represents an increase of 11.1% which clearly shows that the village should not have to carry any further development and will still contribute more than its fair share to the housing provision to the ONE area.

The existing facilities for primary education, green space, recreational facilities, medical facilities and limited public transport, especially to the east of Bridge Road, are almost at breaking point even before the extant consents for 207 houses are delivered. Further pressure on these relatively fragile facilities will come from Newton Kyme where 128 houses have planning consent. Whilst this is 'over the border' in Selby District the reality is that the development site is just one mile from Boston Spa centre yet four miles from the nearest Selby District town which is Tadcaster.

During and as part of the Neighbourhood planning process a village wide questionnaire resulted in a response rate of 37% which is a high return for this type of survey. The responses were also checked against the 2011 Census return to ensure that the responses were in line with the population mix. The overwhelming majority of residents would not support development of over 50 homes in total over all sites. Respondents also strongly opposed any significant development on any individual site. Furthermore the consensus view was that new development should be limited to sites within the existing settlement boundary. It would be contrary to the aims of the Localism Act 2011 and the NPPF Guidance to ignore the views of the local stakeholders.

Whilst the housing numbers do not justify any additional burden on Boston Spa it is recognised that there will inevitably be demand for some additional development. However that must be carefully controlled to respect the wishes of the residents as expressed above and should not be permitted unless technical evidence is provided to identify sufficient capacity within the existing infrastructure. Where this is not available any shortfall identified must be provided as part of the proposed development. These infrastructure improvements must be directly related to, and in scale with, the proposed development. Other than in very exceptional circumstances where infrastructure gaps are identified and cannot be provided as part of the proposed development then such proposals should be refused permission.

The overall housing requirement for Leeds ONE in the next 15 years is understood although we consider it to be unduly optimistic (or pessimistic depending upon your point of view) and probably impossible to deliver. However in furtherance of meeting that objective we would give support to the development of sites 1055 and 3391. See below for site specific comments

We would support the provision of adequate affordable housing for purchase would be supported but this must have availability for locally connected applicants ahead of any wider allocations. To assist with this provision, but bearing in mind the overriding concerns about housing numbers and infrastructure pressures, we would be prepared to support a deviation from Leeds City policy on such housing and set a local requirement for such housing to be provided on smaller developments of say 5 or more additional houses.

Representation ID: REP06558      Question Ref: G2      Greenspace

Consideration could be given to reclassifying surplus green spaces within the locality.

Representation ID: REP06558      Question Ref: G3      Greenspace

Not relevant to Boston Spa

Representation ID: REP06558      Question Ref: G4      Greenspace

Commuted sums could be used to improve the quality of green spaces but only within the immediate locality and not across the whole ward.

# General Comments

---

**Name: David Thomson**

**Representor No: PRS05838**

Representation ID: REP06558      Question Ref: G5

Greenspace

Local resources should only be used to improve green spaces within the community where they are inadequate or of poor quality.

Representation ID: REP06558      Question Ref: G6

Greenspace

We agree

Representation ID: REP06558      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

No other comments other than that each village or community must have its own green spaces assessed and not just be roiled up into the ONE area.

Representation ID: REP06558      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Although the overall analysis of green spaces does identify a shortfall in some of the categories it does disguise significant shortages in some localities such as Boston Spa which has major deficiencies in most of the typologies. Whilst the village is often perceived as being a "green" area that is only because it is surrounded by largely agricultural land which, although it does help with the setting, contributes nothing to the amenity and other essential open spaces needed to support the community.

The City Council's own assessment only identifies four publicly accessible sites of which three are at Deepdale which have been variously categorised as Parks and Gardens, children's play area, skate park and playing field. The playing pitch is less than full size and has no changing or even toilet facility. The remaining "parks and gardens including the open space in the middle of the adjacent housing estate have no seating, no paths, no garden areas, few trees and generally are less like a "park and garden" than almost any space. Apart from the riverside corridor the only other identified spaces are private tennis courts or school playgrounds or fields which are simply not available for use by the community.

In an analysis of the open spaces within the village carried out as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process and comparing actual with theoretical spaces set out in the Core Strategy there is a deficiency of some 16 Ha or over 39 acres. of green space as well as a shortage of 1.83Ha - 4½ acres – of Civic and Market Squares and a shortage of a children's play area.

Please note that in respect of Amenity Greenspace the existing provision includes almost every small piece of grass on any housing estate that is not a roadside verge although many are too small to provide much if any meaningful social space and some of the larger areas have "No ball games" or similar prohibitions due to the demands of nearby residents.

Whilst we must accept that past omissions in the provision of such green spaces does not require future rectification some recognition of the shortages must be taken into account in any future developments by requiring any larger developments to be required to allocate a higher proportion of space to such facilities within the development site.

Representation ID: REP06558      Question Ref: G10

Greenspace

We agree.

---

**Name: Steve & Emma Kitson**

**Representor No: PRS05843**

Representation ID: REP06552      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing in objection to Leeds City Council's plan to build 2300 new homes in the Aireborough area over the next 15 years.

Whilst I understand that new homes are needed in Leeds, many of the proposed sites are on greenfield sites. I find this difficult to comprehend as the proposals contradict the sustainable development priorities for 'Vision for Leeds 2030' on leeds.gov.uk, which state that its aim is to "achieve improvements in economic, social and environmental quality of life at the same time and not at the expense of each other".

As a geography teacher in a Leeds school, I have seen firsthand how sustainability has come to feature heavily in the curriculum in recent years. Green belts, urban sprawl and sustainable development using brownfield sites are all key elements of Edexcel's GCE and GCSE exam specifications. Building on greenfield sites will only send one message to the people of this city; that 'sustainability' is simply rhetoric employed by council officials with no real intention of "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".

Traffic in the Aireborough area is already an issue, and is noticeable even as early as 6.45am in the morning when I leave for work. In addition, the impact on the eco-footprint in this area of Leeds will be significant; green belt replaced by more concrete and tarmac will only lead to an increase in carbon emissions, road traffic accidents and a poorer quality of life for all in this area.

I strongly believe that in your role as Chief Planning Officer you have a duty to conserve greenfield sites for the residents of this city, both now and in the future. I urge you to reconsider the proposals.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Anna Taylor**

**Representor No: PRS05846**

Representation ID: REP06554      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Dear Sir,

Living on the A660 in Bramhope, we deplore the potential plans to build large numbers of houses in the green belt areas when numerous brownfield sites are available in Leeds.

1. A660 very busy already having many accidents

Proximity of Golden Acre Park, inadequate parking leading to cars left on roadside.

2. Total disregard for good, green land used for short-term gain and convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Anna Taylor 206, Leeds Rd., LS169JU

Pamela Berry 200, Leeds Rd., LS169JU

---

**Name: Julie/Brian Clark/Strelczenie**

**Representor No: PRS05858**

Representation ID: REP06578      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I write to object to the outrageous proposal to build nearly 400 houses in Robin Hood. My father has lived in Robin Hood since 1966 and seen many developments new housing etc, all these have caused are increases in congestion the A61 is already like another motorway at peak times. The proposed housing will cause increased pressure on services such as the police doctors dentist who are already over subscribed. The crime rates will increase , noise pollution, this is quite rural community and we wish to keep it that way. Where will the children that will obviously come with this housing estate go to school ? Where will they play ? near the motor way. Leave the green belt alone and go build in the back yard of the property developers.

---

**Name: Mr Strelczenie**

**Representor No: PRS05859**

Representation ID: REP06580      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I write to object to the outrageous proposal to build nearly 400 houses in Robin Hood. My father has lived in Robin Hood since 1966 and seen many developments new housing etc, all these have caused are increases in congestion the A61 is already like another motorway at peak times. The proposed housing will cause increased pressure on services such as the police doctors dentist who are already over subscribed. The crime rates will increase , noise pollution, this is quite rural community and we wish to keep it that way. Where will the children that will obviously come with this housing estate go to school ? Where will they play ? near the motor way. Leave the green belt alone and go build in the back yard of the property developers.

---

**Name: Bob Yeadon**

**Representor No: PRS05864**

Representation ID: REP06585      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am against any future housing development in the little London area.

# General Comments

**Name: Renaissance Land (D20) Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS05865**

Representation ID: REP07484      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

The Council does not intend to find sites to accommodate 4,700 dwellings as they are relying on UDP allocations that have not yet been developed and extant permissions to meet part of the total requirement for the area. However, we question the deliverability of some of the sites and therefore the number of dwellings the Council is proposing to deduct from the requirement figure in this area.

Secondly, 12 of the sites (268 dwellings) are existing UDP allocations that have yet to be developed. Given the UDP was originally adopted in 2001, some 12 years ago, there has to be a detailed review of these sites to determine whether there is a realistic likelihood they will come forward for development. There is no evidence the Council has undertaken any such review. Indeed, there are errors within this section, with Site 645 (Bagley Lane, Farsley) being shown as having capacity for 50 dwellings, when there is Reserved Matters approval for 45 dwellings. The site at Delph End in Pudsey (Ref: 646) is known to have ownership and access constraints and therefore it is not considered this site will deliver the 27 units identified by the Council. This demonstrates the need for a thorough review of the supply the Council is identifying given the deliverability of these sites is essential as this existing supply is being used to determine the number of new sites that will be required. If some of these sites do not deliver the number of dwellings expected, if any at all, but they are included in the Council's supply, this will result in insufficient new sites being identified to meet the requirement in this area.

Firstly, the Council state at paragraph 11.3.2 of the Outer West paper that planning permissions with units still remaining to be built as at 31st March 2012 have been deducted. It is questioned why, when the consultation document is dated June 2013, is the Council using planning permission data that is over a year old.

Secondly, 12 of the sites (268 dwellings) are existing UDP allocations that have yet to be developed. Given the UDP was originally adopted in 2001, some 12 years ago, there has to be a detailed review of these sites to determine whether there is a realistic likelihood they will come forward for development. There is no evidence the Council has undertaken any such review. Indeed, there are errors within this section, with Site 645 (Bagley Lane, Farsley) being shown as having capacity for 50 dwellings, when there is Reserved Matters approval for 45 dwellings. The site at Delph End in Pudsey (Ref: 646) is known to have ownership and access constraints and therefore it is not considered this site will deliver the 27 units identified by the Council. This demonstrates the need for a thorough review of the supply the Council is identifying given the deliverability of these sites is essential as this existing supply is being used to determine the number of new sites that will be required. If some of these sites do not deliver the number of dwellings expected, if any at all, but they are included in the Council's supply, this will result in insufficient new sites being identified to meet the requirement in this area.

Thirdly, the Council advise the supply figure will constantly change as planning permissions are granted, but they do not similarly acknowledge that some permissions may expire without being implemented due to issues with viability or other site development constraints. Again, there does not appear to have been any assessment undertaken of these sites, which form a critical part of the Council's supply, and which determine the number of new sites needed. A site by site review is essential if the Site Allocations DPD is to be found sound as the current approach presents a high risk that insufficient sites will be identified to meet the housing needs of the District, resulting in the plan being ineffective.

The Council identify 48 sites which they state have planning permissions with units still remaining to be built as at 31/03/2012. Given the base date is over a year old it is likely that some of these permissions will have subsequently expired. In addition, as with the undeveloped allocations the Council are including within their supply, there is also evidence that some of the sites with planning permission are undeliverable.

To cite some examples, the outline scheme for 84 flats at Canal Wharf (site ref: 625) was approved on 17 May 2010 and therefore expired on 17 May 2013. This permission was not implemented. The Council has included a site at Westfield Mill which had planning permission for 75 two bed flats. The permission expired on 3 March 2011 and whilst an application was submitted to extend the time limit for implementation, this was later withdrawn and therefore the site no longer benefits from planning permission for the 75 units identified. A site at Swinnow Row (ref: 26) is identified to have capacity for 67 dwellings, yet the most recent permission for the site is for 25 dwellings.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Renaissance Land (D20) Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS05865**

It is also relevant in the context of these representations that site 602 (Pollard Lane LS13) relates to the planning permission for 120 dwellings on the Pollard Lane site and are identified as part of the Council's existing supply with 77 units still to be delivered. However, as previously set out, the remaining part of the scheme is unviable and the revised application that has been submitted seeks to deliver a different mix of dwellings that would ensure the remainder of the scheme is viable. This scheme proposes to deliver 59 dwellings, but as planning permission has not yet been granted it cannot be included as a commitment. In this regard, it would appear appropriate and robust in the context of the Council's commitment table to amend the number of units outstanding to 59 dwellings to reflect the current application.

is clear that if the Council proposes to reduce the number of sites they need by relying on sites with planning permission or current undeveloped UDP allocations, they need to be certain these sites are deliverable and that they will deliver the number of units identified. The Council does not yet appear to have undertaken a detailed review of the deliverability of these sites. This is essential if the plan is to be effective, otherwise there is a significant risk the Council will identify too few sites to meet the identified need.

Whilst it is maintained the Council needs to undertake a review of the sites with planning permission and undeveloped UDP allocations, it is also necessary for the Council to build in an element of flexibility into their future housing supply. The approach at the moment appears to be based on premise that all of the sites with planning permission and undeveloped allocations will deliver the quantum of dwellings the Council has identified and that new sites will be identified to meet the remainder of the requirement. Yet given the plan period will span over at least 15 years it is possible that some sites will not deliver the number of houses expected and some may not come forward at all, as has been the case with the UDP allocations. On this basis, the Council need to identify sites to deliver in excess of requirement to ensure they have a flexible supply. The lack of flexibility is in part why we do not support a fixed percentage for each characteristic area.

---

**Name: David Hamblett**

**Representor No: PRS05867**

Representation ID: REP06593      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I live in Yeadon, North-West Leeds. I understand that Leeds City Council Planning is proposing to build 2,300 new houses in the Aireborough region. As I am sure the planners are aware, there are severe traffic problems, along the A65 through Rawdon, Yeadon, Guiseley, Menston and Ilkley, during both rush hours and for most of the weekend.

I would like to know (i) what studies have been undertaken to measure congestion in the area, if any; (ii), what studies are planned, if any; and (iii) what proposals there are, if any, to relieve the congestion e.g. by upgrading the road network in some way.

I am sure that the Council and planners are aware, that the severity of the congestion over recent years, has driven traffic onto side roads and through housing estates, to the extent that it has been necessary to introduce traffic calming measures. I am also keen to understand (iv) what studies have been undertaken to measure the indirect effects of increasing the number of houses in area, while failing to upgrade the transport infrastructure to cope, particularly those relating to (v) safety, such as the number of traffic related accidents.



# General Comments

---

**Name: George Geapin**

**Representor No: PRS05871**

Representation ID: REP06601      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I have collected the site allocation plans from the Library. I can understand the thinking behind the project, but have serious reservations re costs. The council will be paying Viola over £20.5m a year for the next twenty five years to save £8 Million a year. They will also plan to spend at least £80 Million making a new route for the Folley bus scheme Stouton to Holt Park. The more we look into the costs the more questionable it looks.

As I said I can understand and appreciate that the public is being consulted.

Unfortunately we have the most archaic transport system in Leeds. Until some get to grips with the problem. Is a little point in housing offices works etc unless there is a proper organised bus system. At present its fragmented. Metro has no idea what Arriva First and Centre bus are doing. I had to go by Hunslet by bus. I spent three hours looking for the company. The streets had no signs, I never found it.

The council are spending £121 Million on the route for the Folley bus.

I see no point in this.

I cannot comment on the Outer North East and Airborough. I would have thought only the Site plan to this area was of interest to us.

Being that the council rode roughshod over public concern re the Incinerator at Pontefract Lane and seemingly with the Folley bus system. It makes one chary of believing that any notice will be taken over local opinion. There are areas which require re-developing and planning. There has been another shopping mall in Leeds. There are so many I wonder where all the money is coming from to buy things. Its employment waned. By the way do we really need 99 councillors. To save money the council closed the Leisure centres. Its ripped the heart out of this area. Leeds Leisure Centre. Viola will get £150,000 per day for the next twenty five years and could not donate two days profit to the council to keep the Leisure centre open. Now that's what I planning should be about.

It'll be a plan for this area Halton and Temple Newsome and Crossgates

---

**Name: Sue Talbot**

**Representor No: PRS05872**

Representation ID: REP06602      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Thank you for your email and the information about the consultation on the 15 year development plan.

I must say that a consultation period of one month about the next 15 years does seem a little rushed. However I'm more concerned that the quality of the housing map is so poor that it is impossible to see where the coloured areas pertain to. This being the case I have looked no further.

Given the quality of the information provided, this cannot be considered a valid consultation, which exposes the Council to unnecessary challenge.

I would suggest that the consultation should be re-scheduled so that documents can be made available in a suitable format for the purposes of a more through-going consultation process.

---

**Name: Neil Dawson**

**Representor No: PRS05884**

Representation ID: REP06563      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

The LDF strategy has identified a need to accommodate a total housing target of 66,000 dwellings. This overall target has remained constant since the early drafts of the core strategy. I believe the overall city wide target should be reviewed due to the continued downturn in the economy and unprecedented slow recovery which was not anticipated three years ago. It is possible that this slow recovery and the continuing depression in the Housing market will continue for the foreseeable future and therefore the LDF plan and housing allocation should be adjusted accordingly.

The low numbers of housing completions in Leeds in 2012 and 2013 are below the levels envisaged in the plan and therefore the overall housing target should be revised to accommodate this period of very low housing growth.

The overall population growth in Leeds and in the Outer South West is not as great as anticipated in the initial stages of the plan and using the 2011 census it would seem opportune to revise the overall housing target downwards.

---

**Name: Kathleen Smith**

**Representor No: PRS05890**

Representation ID: REP06638      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Please let me know where we bring all the objection forms we got from Leonardo buildings .....we only found out about all this by accident.....no one in the village knew about it.....we think this has all been done by the back door.....there were no letters sent out.....nothing..... When we found out by accident about this .....no one....in the village knew about it why is it never put up in the village to let people know. we have had a meeting in the village and will be .....bringing down objections....where shall we bring them to.....this village is not big enough to build 120 houses on the main feed into the village we have to mount the pavement now to let other vehicles through there is plenty of land down the bottom of Whitehall road Harper farm etc and a main road Low Moor side road ....Walsh Lane.....Lawns Lane and the Maple estate would be horrendous

# General Comments

---

**Name: Julie Parker**

**Representor No: PRS05900**

Representation ID: REP06649      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

There are plenty of empty houses requiring repair and brown field sites to build on. Please consider leaving some green belt sites as they are to give our future generations places to enjoy.

I really do hope that all concerns are taken into consideration when the consultation period comes to an end.

---

**Name: Kirsty And Tim Thornton**

**Representor No: PRS05902**

Representation ID: REP06650      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

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!)

Representation ID: REP06917      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

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 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 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: REP06917      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

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 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?

# General Comments

---

**Name: Amanda Fell**

**Representor No: PRS05903**

Representation ID: REP06652      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

It was with some disquiet that I first learned that planning permission was being sought to build a number of affordable houses on Greenfield sites in the Little London area. However when it became clear that the extent of the proposed building was much greater than was first thought I was to say the least devastated.

My husbands family have lived in the area for many years, and on the death of my husbands maternal grandmother, my husband and myself worked very hard to save the money needed to buy the property.

We chose to live in Little London because it is a conservation area. There are many listed building, beautiful views, also delightful walks within a very short distance from our home. However should the proposed building go ahead it will have a permanent detrimental effect on this Historic, charming area of Rawdon.. The proposed new builds would be cheek by jowl with buildings of several hundred years old, these houses are full of character and charm and are part of our Heritage which I believe must be preserved at all cost. Green belt areas are being eroded throughout the area as more building takes place ( what is happening to our green and pleasant land? ) I am sure there is enough brown belt ripe for development.

I of course do not need to point to you that the devastating effects such a proposal would have on local services. Education, Health, Emergency services, and transport. At the moment Schools, Doctors, Dentists, are full to capacity. Many of the local roads are completely gridlocked particularly at rush hour, increasing the number of vehicles using these roads would be unthinkable, and dangerous. Risking more RTA And delaying emergency services.

To conclude. I feel very strongly that the planning permission being sought should be rejected because of the reasons stated above. Although I am aware of the need for more affordable housing, I also believe we need the balance of open spaces and green fields, for ourselves and for future generations to enjoy. PLEASE think carefully and plan wisely for our future.

Yours Hopefully.  
Amanda L Fell.

---

Representation ID: REP07276      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

It was with some disquiet that I first learned that planning permission was being sought to build a number of affordable houses on Greenfield sites in the Little London area. However when it became clear that the extent of the proposed building was much greater than was first thought I was to say the least devastated.

My husbands family have lived in the area for many years, and on the death of my husbands maternal grandmother, my husband and myself worked very hard to save the money needed to buy the property.

We chose to live in Little London because it is a conservation area. There are many listed building, beautiful views, also delightful walks within a very short distance from our home. However should the proposed building go ahead it will have a permanent detrimental effect on this Historic, charming area of Rawdon.. The proposed new builds would be cheek by jowl with buildings of several hundred years old, these houses are full of character and charm and are part of our Heritage which I believe must be preserved at all cost. Green belt areas are being eroded throughout the area as more building takes place ( what is happening to our green and pleasant land? ) I am sure there is enough brown belt ripe for development.

I of course do not need to point to you that the devastating effects such a proposal would have on local services. Education, Health, Emergency services, and transport. At the moment Schools, Doctors, Dentists, are full to capacity. Many of the local roads are completely gridlocked particularly at rush hour, increasing the number of vehicles using these roads would be unthinkable, and dangerous. Risking more RTA And delaying emergency services.

To conclude. I feel very strongly that the planning permission being sought should be rejected because of the reasons stated above. Although I am aware of the need for more affordable housing, I also believe we need the balance of open spaces and green fields, for ourselves and for future generations to enjoy. PLEASE think carefully and plan wisely for our future.

---

**Name: Suzanne Kaberry**

**Representor No: PRS05908**

Representation ID: REP06658      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Dear Councillor Anderson,

I write to express my concerns regarding the number of development sites currently being proposed for Adel.

As an Adel resident and a parent of a young child I am naturally concerned about the effect on my daughters education should school sizes have to increase to cope with the influx of new pupils to the area. The schools are of an excellent standard and the increase in both schools capacity or pupil numbers will only have a negative effect on teaching. Adel St John in particular has a wonderful community spirit which would be under threat should all these new homes be added to the catchment area.

The traffic is already causing major issues for Adel residents, particularly on Adel Lane/Church Lane junction as traffic is regularly at a stand still with drivers waiting to use the traffic lights with Otley Road. This is without the new residents who will soon be living in Centurion Fields, most of which will be 2 car households! I attach some images I captured yesterday at 6.30pm including cars making dangerous manoeuvres to get round the road block. It is only a matter of time until a serious accident occurs at this junction. We're already at breaking point with traffic.

I have not registered at the local Doctor surgery in Adel as I know it is already very difficult to get seen by the GP in a reasonable time. Therefore I choose to use a surgery outside of Adel to ensure that my family are well looked after. An increase in patient numbers will be put a huge strain on an already stretched service.

Proceeding with the development on previously un-built land is also a great concern. It will alter the character and beauty of the area enormously and have a detrimental effect to the environment.

Many thanks and kind regards,  
Suzanne Kaberry

# General Comments

---

**Name: Matthew Brooke**

**Representor No: PRS05913**

Representation ID: REP06667      Question Ref: G4

Greenspace

G4. The quality of many existing green space sites in the area falls below the required standard. Do you agree that resources should be channelled to improving the quality of existing sites?

Absolutely. Provided the NPPF tests are met in order to secure a planning obligation, it is entirely appropriate to seek contributions from development proposals that would exert further pressure on existing green space. It is also entirely appropriate to incorporate on site green space into new developments which are of significant scale and where the size of site will allow.

Representation ID: REP06667      Question Ref: G5

Greenspace

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 green space elsewhere?

Yes, this is already the default UDP policy position?

Representation ID: REP06667      Question Ref: G6

Greenspace

G6. Do you agree that, where opportunities arise, new green space provision in areas that fall below accessibility standards, to ensure residents have adequate access to different types of green space?

Yes.

---

**Name: Natalie O'Reardon**

**Representor No: PRS05914**

Representation ID: REP06668      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am a resident of the Aireborough area and was horrified to be informed a housing development of more than 350 houses has been proposed on green belt fields in our area.

Not only will the loss of these fields have a massive impact on the environment, 350 new homes will put around 1000 new cars on the road in an already heavily congested area. Not to mention school, doctor and dentist places where it is already difficult to get into your local one.

Representation ID: REP06668      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am also very concerned that the local residents, I live on Barfield drive, have not been informed about this development that will impact on there quality of living greatly.

I strongly object to this development and would like to know when this was proposed and why we have not been informed.

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Colin Fairburn

**Representor No:** PRS05916

Representation ID: REP06671      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

As an established local estate agent who lives in Bramhope and sells property across Leeds 16 I would like to make the following comments relating to the proposed site allocations of additional housing.

Bramhope -

A large increase in housing in Bramhope will cause the following problems:

The A660 (Leeds Road) is very busy as it is - more houses mean more cars

The roads in Bramhope are almost exclusively narrower than the 'average' road with many streets not even having pavements - the increase in traffic will cause an immense amount of problems.

The school in Bramhope is over subscribed as it is - a half mile radius catchment area is now in force - how on earth is the school expected to cope with more house housing more children?

The doctors surgery is simply not large enough to cope with such a large increase in the population of the village

The bus service into Leeds is, at best erratic and at worst appalling - my wife has been travelling into Leeds every day for the past 12 years and can testify to that

The type of housing that is likely to be built will almost certainly be 'executive style' housing - we simply do NOT need any more of this type of housing - we cant sell the ones weve got - building more just doesnt make any sense whatsoever.

The character of the village will change forever, and as such as planners you shoulder a huge burden of responsibility to ensure that future generations (and indeed current ones) do not have their lives blighted by ill thought out and ill advised decisions

Every site is a green field site - it is an outrage that green fields should be built on - find brownfield sites and make the developers act in a more creative way and make them build the houses that are actually needed for first time buyers and the rental market.

There will be a severe impact on the wildlife of the area

Cookridge - (Moseley Wood Gardens)

There are a large number of natural springs in the area designated which will be of a major problem if developed - where will the water go?

The proposed site is strewn with massive boulders under the ground

I understand that the railway line close by could be adversely affected by any development

The site is a green field site - it is an outrage that green fields should be built on - find brownfield sites and make the developers act in a more creative way and make them build the houses that are actually needed for first time buyers and the rental market.

There will be a severe impact on the wildlife of the area

The local infrastructure simply could not cope with a large increase in the housing and subsequent traffic increase.

Peoples lives should not be blighted in this way - it is morally wrong. There are plenty of brownfield sites in the city for affordable housing to be built.

Adel

Adel does not need more 'executive style' housing - the building on Church Lane is having a detrimental effect on the environment, peoples living standards and it is drawing people away from buying resale homes. We have noticed a larger than usual amount of 4 bedroom houses remaining unsold as people decide to buy new instead. Increasing the housing stock with new homes merely shifts the demand. It is not actually needed. With the Bodington site acquired for yet MORE 'executive style' homes will only further exacerbate the situation further.

Further development of Adel will lead to increased traffic onto the A660 which is already over stretched to capacity.

Enough is enough.

Please listen to the ordinary people - not the developers - they are not the ones who have to live with the decisions that you and your colleagues are having to make.

---

**Name:** Bupinder Dev

**Representor No:** PRS05917

Representation ID: REP06683      Question Ref: G4

Greenspace

Yes, all s106 and CIL secured in the North Leeds Area should be spent in the North Leeds Area to improve and maintain the quality of existing sites.

# General Comments

---

**Name: John Clayton**

**Representor No: PRS05918**

Representation ID: REP06672      Question Ref: H1

Housing

I have just been watching a programme about the declining bee population in this country and the serious effect it will have for all of us in the future if allowed to continue as crops will not be pollinated etc etc. Part of the problem is the massive loss of meadowland since the second world war, mainly done in ignorance. So in these enlightened times, with the backing of Prince Charles, we should be looking at ways to preserve and extend our greenfield sites and meadows.....shouldn't we??

Not so with Leeds City Council however. They seem determined to use up any small area of field and build houses without it seems any thought for the consequences. I was told by Councillor Latty some months ago when speaking to him about the possibility of building on Rawdon Billing that councils now have to consider all aspects and the impact any building work would have on the infrastructure. Fine. So why then are they even thinking about building in some of the places they are. I don't know whether any of them have tried to drive up the A65 at busy times or weekends. It is virtually a car park from Guiseley Morrisons roundabout back to JCT roundabout and beyond.

They have already made it worse by the development at Menston. There is the postponed development at Kirkstall Forge. So why on earth are they even considering exacerbating the problem by proposing to build 155 houses off Gill Lane, 125 on Green Lane and even more in the fields at the back of Layton Lane. Imagine what the A65 is going to be like when these houses are occupied!!

In addition the local schools are already full to capacity so where are the children of these families to be educated? Where are the doctors/ dental services to come from? Come on Leeds City Council. You want Leeds to be at the cutting edge of forward thinking and to be the most green city in the North if not the entire country. Have a thought for the infrastructure around here and do the right thing.....not to build on greenfield sites

---

**Name: Diane Brown**

**Representor No: PRS05919**

Representation ID: REP06673      Question Ref: G1

Greenspace

Could you please investigate the Swillington Lane Allotments on your maps please? They are not shown on the LCC maps (green spaces) for the current consultation process , is it possible to look into this and change the map or add as an Addendum?

Representation ID: REP07258      Question Ref: G1

Greenspace

Hello,

Could you please investigate the Swillington Lane Allotments on your maps please? They are not shown on the LCC maps (green spaces) for the current consultation process , is it possible to look into this and change the map or add as an Addendum?

If you could let me know

Kind regards

Diane Brown

Parish Clerk Swillington Parish Council

Representation ID: REP07400      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Could you please investigate the Swillington Lane Allotments on your maps please? They are not shown on the LCC maps (green spaces) for the current consultation process , is it possible to look into this and change the map or add as an Addendum?

If you could let me know

Kind regards

---

**Name: Simon Frostick**

**Representor No: PRS05920**

Representation ID: REP06680      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

I believe there is an omission from the green space plan adjacent to site 2120. Immediately north east of the site on the opposite side of the railway cutting from site 649 is a shaded area on your plan. This is Owlcotes Plantation, a nicely maturing broadleaf woodland plantation that should be recognised as publicly accessible green space and protected.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Scott Burton**

**Representor No: PRS05921**

Representation ID: REP06677      Question Ref: H7

Housing

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: Yvonne Hardaker**

**Representor No: PRS05927**

Representation ID: REP06688      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing with concern about proposed development plans in my area. I attended the public exhibition at Pudsey Civic Centre and was appalled at the amount of development on the plans. I strongly object to all these proposals. The green belt is precious and should be preserved. The schools will be overcrowded as well as the roads, doctors & dentists are already overworked and who can afford these houses? These proposals will be severely detrimental to the area both on a safety issue and a traffic issue. Pudsey is losing its identity, it is becoming part of the Leeds urban sprawl and we do not seem to be able to stop this. I hope you take these comments seriously and that other people bother to object.

---

**Name: Brian Gascoigne**

**Representor No: PRS05928**

Representation ID: REP05609      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I think the large chimney should be demolished. The increased traffic on Rufford Avenue where there is a Primary School and elderly people's flats near a sharp bend will create danger. I do not live on Rufford Avenue, but I walk along it, at times now is very scary. We need homes - houses look better than a derelict mill. I hope the wildlife can be preserved or transferred. Regarding the reference above to traffic, all the cars will turn left up Green Lane then left on Rufford Avenue to access Yeadons shops etc and of course back again

---

**Name: Andrea Pattison**

**Representor No: PRS05931**

Representation ID: REP06696      Question Ref: H7

Housing

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

---

**Name: Eileen Wilkins**

**Representor No: PRS05932**

Representation ID: REP06697      Question Ref: H4

Housing

3033 Highfold farm  
1104 Greenside Farm ( Emsleys )  
2162 Warm Lane.

I object to building because they are conservation sites and habitat for wildlife. We are fast running out of these areas in this part of Leeds and we do not want to destroy areas that can not be replaced. Once these sites are built on there is no going back. I am thinking of our future generations who would value and respect these green areas. By building on these areas we are not allowing any space between villages and boundaries making the area builtup and over developed. The A65 is already congested and dangerous for pedestrians and more houses will just add to this. Drivers are sick of the crawl in traffic to get through Guiseley and Yeadon as it is and I envisage rat-running to ease this . I also have concerns re local facilities being over stretched with more residents needing to access them. All in all there must be more appropriate sites in other areas of Leeds that building new houses would improve the area for local people. Please build there not on cherished sites.

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Tony X

**Representor No:** PRS05934

Representation ID: REP06701      Question Ref: H7

Housing

This is to resister 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!



## General Comments

---

**Name: Nick Lane-Fox**

**Representor No: PRS05944**

Representation ID: REP06705      Question Ref: H7

Housing

3.4Question H7. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'red' are not suitable for allocation for future housing development?

Representation : YES for site references 1027 and 3134. The detailed reasons to support this representation are found at the submitted Landscape Assessment document.

Representation ID: REP06705      Question Ref: H7

Housing

3.5Question H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why?

Representation: this question appears erroneous given all the other questions from H1 to H15. However, for clarity sake see our responses at the other relevant questions in this letter.

Representation ID: REP06705      Question Ref: H14

Housing

3.7Question H14. Do you think there are any sites being considered in this area could be suitable for use solely or in part for elderly housing accommodation?

Representation: YES. Site reference 1106. See the Detailed Site Analysis document and the section on Vitality and local housing needs. There is a clear identified need for suitable housing to support long term independent living by senior members of the community. Part of site reference 1106 would be required to deliver on this identified need.

Representation ID: REP06705      Question Ref: H4a

Housing

3.3Question H4a. Do you think that the development of a new settlement at Spen Common Lane, near Bramham could be delivered sustainably and represents a better alternative to the amber sites?

Representation : No. There is scant evidence released in the Site Allocation Issues and Options consultation to support the allocation of site reference 3391. This work should have been undertaken by the Council before it released the current consultation document to add any context and meaning to this process. The response to question H4a has to be no on this basis. This is not a sound basis on which to advance a consultation on potential site allocations.

There is no policy provision in the current Core Strategy Submission Draft for allocation of this site. Spatial Policy 1: Location of Development makes no reference to the allowance for sustainable new settlements, it seeks to concentrate the majority of development within the Main Urban Area, Major Settlements and Smaller Settlements.

It should not be drawn from this representation, however, that we are stating that the amber sites present a better alternative.

Representation ID: REP06991      Question Ref: H7

Housing

this question appears erroneous given all the other questions from H1 to H15. However, for clarity sake see our responses at the other relevant questions in this letter.

See also representation submitted for full details

---

**Name: Sarah Connors**

**Representor No: PRS05952**

Representation ID: REP06720      Question Ref: H7

Housing

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

# General Comments

Name: Peter Bellwood

Representor No: PRS05956

Representation ID: REP06724      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I would like to raise my objections to the Council plans to develop green sites in the Aireborough area over the next 15 years. I have been a resident living on Apperley Lane, the A658 for almost 20 years and must say that the plans put forward clearly show the Councils lack of understanding at the issues facing residents. In fact, to say that you, the recipients of this email, who are so called 'Councillors/MP's/ Chief Planning Officer, people who represent the local people and area, must have no concept of the problems we face on a daily basis and I have to question whether you are fit for purpose in the positions you hold. A list of issues to support my stance are as follows:

1) Traffic. My address is Layton Cottage, Apperley Lane, Yeadon Leeds, LS19 7DY. I live on the A658. My drive forms part of a Public Footpath that leads to the field off Warm Lane. I see the volume of traffic every morning and afternoon, 7 days per week, the articulated lorries heading both ways at high speeds since they were stopped from travelling down Micklefield Lane some time ago. I have seen old walls that form part of the public footpath and garden boundaries fall over through lack of proper drainage and vibration. I see on a daily basis the queues of traffic heading towards Leeds, Bradford, Harrogate and Ilkley. The proposal to put a potential further 1000 vehicles on the road is laughable. I suggest you all spend time between 07.00 and 09.30 and 16.00 to 19.30 every day to understand the issues.

2) Drainage. a) Since the new Littlemore School was built on Micklefield Park and the lie of the land was changed, the archaic drainage facilities cannot cope with the amount of water running off the Park. Since the Council, in its wisdom, raised the level of the A658 to above kerb level, the water literally cascades over the kerbs, does not run into the grates kerbside but into small gulleys that cannot cope, that are constantly blocked with leaves and grit that the Council rarely clear, down the Public Footpath onto my drive and into the fields.

3) Drainage. b) In addition to the water running down the public footpath, have you ever seen the water levels that congregate in the fields surrounding my property? There can be a collection of water up to 30 feet in circumference in both fields. Look at the state of Gill Lane in winter. Look at the state of the woods at the bottom of Warm Lane. You cannot walk through them until the middle of summer because of the amount of standing water.

4) Local Services. a) Are you intending to build more schools, dentists, doctors surgeries, if so, where?

5) Local Services. b) I have lived at these premises for 20 years. In that time, do you know how many times the Council have maintained the footpath that leads to my gates? They have not maintained it once. We have to clear the debris from the roads, clear the weeds and generally maintain its upkeep 6 times per year. More traffic, more rubbish down the 'Public' footpath which the council does not maintain.

5) In September 2011, I had planning permission rejected to convert the single storey part of my property into 2 storey and merge it into the existing 2 storey part of the property. Application Number 11/03809/FU. I am surrounded by fields on 3 sides and my front boundary is approx 50 metres from the A658, protected by mature trees on either side of the footpath, hidden from the A658. We overlook nobody and the plans were rejected 'by virtue of its size and scale and prominent first floor location which represents a disproportionate addition to the dwelling which together with the cumulative impact of previous extensions would produce development HARMFUL TO THE PRINCIPLE, PURPOSE AND OPENNESS OF THE GREEN BELT. Do your plans not fall into a much similar category on a much larger scale? Please explain.

I have enjoyed 20 years living in the area but bitterly disappointed at the proposals, and although I agree that more housing is needed feel very strongly that there are more suitable areas to develop before the Council decides to write off Green Field sites that are few and far between and give a pleasant outlook to the area.

# General Comments

Name: Peter Bellwood

Representor No: PRS05956

Representation ID: REP07085      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to raise my objections to the Council plans to develop green sites in the Aireborough area over the next 15 years. I have been a resident living on Apperley Lane, the A658 for almost 20 years and must say that the plans put forward clearly show the Councils lack of understanding at the issues facing residents. In fact, to say that you, the recipients of this email, who are so called 'Councillors/MP's/ Chief Planning Officer, people who represent the local people and area, must have no concept of the problems we face on a daily basis and I have to question whether you are fit for purpose in the positions you hold. A list of issues to support my stance are as follows:

1) Traffic. My address is Layton Cottage, Apperley Lane, Yeadon Leeds, LS19 7DY. I live on the A658. My drive forms part of a Public Footpath that leads to the field off Warm Lane. I see the volume of traffic every morning and afternoon, 7 days per week, the articulated lorries heading both ways at high speeds since they were stopped from travelling down Micklefield Lane some time ago. I have seen old walls that form part of the public footpath and garden boundaries fall over through lack of proper drainage and vibration. I see on a daily basis the queues of traffic heading towards Leeds, Bradford, Harrogate and Ilkley. The proposal to put a potential further 1000 vehicles on the road is laughable. I suggest you all spend time between 07.00 and 09.30 and 16.00 to 19.30 every day to understand the issues.

2) Drainage. a) Since the new Littlemore School was built on Micklefield Park and the lie of the land was changed, the archaic drainage facilities cannot cope with the amount of water running off the Park. Since the Council, in its wisdom, raised the level of the A658 to above kerb level, the water literally cascades over the kerbs, does not run into the grates kerbside but into small gulleys that cannot cope, that are constantly blocked with leaves and grit that the Council rarely clear, down the Public Footpath onto my drive and into the fields.

3) Drainage. b) In addition to the water running down the public footpath, have you ever seen the water levels that congregate in the fields surrounding my property? There can be a collection of water up to 30 feet in circumference in both fields. Look at the state of Gill Lane in winter. Look at the state of the woods at the bottom of Warm Lane. You cannot walk through them until the middle of summer because of the amount of standing water.

4) Local Services. a) Are you intending to build more schools, dentists, doctors surgeries, if so, where?

5) Local Services. b) I have lived at these premises for 20 years. In that time, do you know how many times the Council have maintained the footpath that leads to my gates? They have not maintained it once. We have to clear the debris from the roads, clear the weeds and generally maintain its upkeep 6 times per year. More traffic, more rubbish down the 'Public' footpath which the council does not maintain.

5) In September 2011, I had planning permission rejected to convert the single storey part of my property into 2 storey and merge it into the existing 2 storey part of the property. Application Number 11/03809/FU. I am surrounded by fields on 3 sides and my front boundary is approx 50 metres from the A658, protected by mature trees on either side of the footpath, hidden from the A658. We overlook nobody and the plans were rejected 'by virtue of its size and scale and prominent first floor location which represents a disproportionate addition to the dwelling which together with the cumulative impact of previous extensions would produce development HARMFUL TO THE PRINCIPLE, PURPOSE AND OPENNESS OF THE GREEN BELT. Do your plans not fall into a much similar category on a much larger scale? Please explain.

I have enjoyed 20 years living in the area but bitterly disappointed at the proposals, and although I agree that more housing is needed feel very strongly that there are more suitable areas to develop before the Council decides to write off Green Field sites that are few and far between and give a pleasant outlook to the area.

# General Comments

Name: Adrian & Linda Heeley

Representor No: PRS05959

Representation ID: REP06730      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

A few weeks ago a questionnaire came from Rawdon PC re the proposed developments around the Billing and Rawdon Village, and now ANOTHER pamphlet outlining LCC proposed development of GREEN FIELD sites to the W and N of the A658.

1. What is LCC trying to do ? -obliterate every piece of land that looks green in this area ; has LCC got a policy of " if lands looks green lets build on it" ?

2 What are my Conservative councillors' views on these proposals ? - they seem very quiet at the moment

3. You are all familiar with my previous concerns about the over capacity of the A658 and A65 in this area

a. Apperley Lane and Green Lane is a joke and tragedy is waiting to happen . This road CANNOT cope with any more capacity and the development of the sites refered to above would just add to that capacity . HGVs threaten our very existence , and despite several enquiries to you, there seems to be no will to address the mockery of road traffic acts and 30mph restrictions - the worst culprits being HGVs

b. the top of Green Lane is a joke for an "A" road. Two HGVc CANNOT pass each other , yet the great, wide, Harrogate Road to the S of the Green Lane junction is free of all HGVs- very nice for residents down there ( Councillors included, I believe) .Whatever happened to the sensible suggestion of a one-way system for HGVs ie Apperley Lane northbound, Harrogate Road southbound ?

c. The development of ANY of the above sites will inevitably add to these problems- and what about Gill Lane and Warm Lane - oh my,oh my!! have ANYof you tried turning R at top of Warm Lane into Apperley Lane ?

d. Whatever has happened to GREENBELT LAND ? or is it the grand plan of LCC to develop the A658 corridor to link into Bradford to make a supercity ? You are aware that this country is getting to a stage where we are not self-sufficient in food - yet these development sites are PRIME agricultural land - what is the CONservative policy on this ? -does it support the destruction of greenbelt and reducing valuable agricultural land . Whilst they are at it why not build on Rawdon Golf Club course - its not productive,its not agricultural and only used for recreation , and Horsforth Golf Club too -plenty of land there , and its green . The quality of life of residents on and by Apperley Lane has vastly declined over the years ( started ,of course, by diverting the old A658 from Harrogate Road to the far less suitable Green Lane/Apperley Lane) One of the qualities we still have is a fantastic view to the west over to Baildon and Ilkley Moors and it is a joy - oh dear says LCC, we can't have that, lets obliterate it with new housing .

e. although the transport infrastrucure is the key to all this , where are the extra schools, doctors' surgeries, dentists etc etc going to be developed ? . As you will be aware the capacity of these institutions locally is at maximum - or do we just keep packing them in ?

f IN CONCLUSION - the development of ANY site in Rawdon and Yeadon would be a scandal and a disgrace . There are plenty of ex-industrial and brown field sites in Leeds that are not being developed first . PLEASE LEAVE AIREBOROUGH ALONE . How much more can these roads take ? - or has LCC got another surprise up its sleeve and planning to build a by-pass ! ( not a silly idea!)

g. I would be VERY intersted to here the views of my local Conservative Councillors AND my Conservative MP on these proposals

# General Comments

**Name:** GMI Group  
**Representor No:** PRS05961

Representation ID: REP06733      Question Ref: H3      Housing

Currently, Leeds City Council have not had an opportunity to fully consider the clear potential of this site [Land off Thorpe Park, Austhorpe]. The short term opportunities in respect to the delivery of much needed housing in a sustainable location are considerable. This representation sets out why this site is a suitable site for housing. This site should be colour coded green.

# General Comments

**Name: GMI Group**

**Representor No: PRS05961**

Representation ID: REP06733      Question Ref: H10

Housing

A red line boundary plan is provided at Appendix 1. The whole site is owned/under option by the GMI Group. This site was not included in the Leeds Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options Document. The site has also not yet been included within the provisions of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The site consists of infill land to the south of residential dwellings on Barrowby Lane. The site is bounded to the north by Barrowby Lane, east and south by employment land and west by dwellings at Austhorpe Gardens. The site is currently designated as employment land covered by policies E4(6) and E18(2) in the Leeds UDPR. There are two major planning permissions covering the development of the Thorpe Park business park. A third major application has been made recently for a mixed retail, commercial, leisure and office development which is in part aimed at helping to fund the Manston Lane Link Road (part of the East Leeds Orbital Road).

Although residential development would result in a small amount of employment land being lost, the arguments in favour of residential development are significant. The arguments are as follows:-

- The overall adequate supply of employment locally and across Leeds;
- The relatively slow pace of development at Thopre Park in recent years and the ample scale of new office development in the northwards expansion; and,
- The lack of a deliverable 5 year housing land supply.

The site measures 1.3ha and is suitable for the delivery of approximately 14 residential dwellings. The site is accessed from Century Way. The future use of the existing access stub was considered as part of Planning Application 12/00646/FU and although Leeds City Council were happy for Barrowby Lane to be used in that case, Leeds City Council 'Highways' did not raise any concerns in respect to that site being accessed from Thorpe Park. Although site is accessed via Century Way the site is outside the ownership of Thorpe Park.

The site is approximately 2.6km away from the town of Garforth. In Garforth town centre there are a wide range of shops and services including a supermarket, banks, building societies, estate agents, hairdressers and pubs. In terms of local services, there is a newsagents 400m from the site. Colton Retail Park and Colton Mill are approximately 500m from the site. There are a range of shops and food outlets including a large Sainsbury's supermarket. The site has good access to public transport, education and health facilities. The site is located approximately 1.6km from Cross Gates Railway Station where regular services to Leeds, Bradford, Huddersfield, York and Selby can be accessed. There are bus stops located on Century Way, approximately 260m from the site. The following services can be accessed:

- 19A – Tinshill to Garforth via Leeds (every 30 minutes)
- 844 – Leeds to York via Cross Gates, Tadcaster and Copmanthorpe (every 30 minutes)

Bus stops are also located on Selby Road / Ring Road, 400m from the site. The following services can be accessed:

- 9 – Horsforth to Seacroft via Pudsey, White Rose Centre, Rothwell and Cross Gates (every hour)
- 163 / 166 – Castleford to Leeds via Kippax, Garforth and Cross Gates (every 15 minutes)
- 402 / 403 – Selby to Leeds via Micklefield, Garforth and Cross Gates (20 and 55 past the hour)
- 844 – Leeds to York via Cross Gates, Tadcaster and Copmanthorpe (every 30 minutes)

The site is extremely well placed to access the M1 motorway. Junction 46 is approximately 550m from the site. The site is close to two primary schools, Austhorpe Primary School, 520m from the site and Colton Primary School, 750m from the site. The nearest secondary schools are, Temple Moor High School Science College, 2.1km away, John Smeaton Community College, 2.1km away and Garforth Academy, 2.6m away. With regard to health facilities, the nearest GP surgery is Colton Mill Medical Centre 600m away from the site. ADP Dental is 1.4km away from the site in Cross Gates. The nearest pharmacy is at Colton Retail Park 500m away. The site is well located in respect to other recently approved residential housing developments. Eleven detached dwelling have recently been approved (June 2012) by Leeds City Council to the north of the site. The site is very close to local employment areas including the Thorpe Park estate.

## Policy

The allocation of this site for housing development is consistent with the adopted National Planning Policy Framework. This states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.

Framework states that every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. The objectives for the Framework include building a strong competitive economy, promoting sustainable transport and delivering a wide choice of high quality homes. Draft Core Strategy Spatial Policy 1 Location of Development sets out that to deliver the spatial development strategy based on the Leeds settlement hierarchy it will concentrate the majority of new development within urban areas taking advantage of existing services and high levels of accessibility. This policy states that the urban areas and major settlements will be expected to deliver significant amounts of development, including sustainable extensions. 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. 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 (5%) as extensions. The housing distribution by housing market characteristic area for East Leeds is 11,400 which is 17% of the total housing requirement for the Leeds district.

## Conclusions

The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47). The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and GMI Group. The site is in a sustainable location and suitable for the delivery of housing as detailed in this response. There are no insurmountable physical problems of limitations associated with this site 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. It is likely that a planning application will be submitted to Leeds City Council towards the end of 2013. Therefore for the reasons set out above, we consider that this site at Austhorpe should be included in the Site Allocations Plan as a housing allocation.

# General Comments

**Name: GMI Group**

**Representor No: PRS05961**

Representation ID: REP06733      Question Ref: H11

Housing

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

Representation ID: REP06733      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy. There remain outstanding objections to the Core Strategy, of particular relevance are those relating to the overall quantum of housing requirement and the proposed distribution of the requirement. Our representations submitted on behalf of a consortium of house builders recommended that the overall housing requirement should be increased to conform with the Council's own SHMA evidence of housing need. Should the housing requirement increase, the Site Allocations DPD will obviously need to consider its initial appraisal of promoted sites in order to conform with the Core Strategy requirements.

Representation ID: REP07024      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Preferred Locations for Growth

1.13 From a strategic perspective, we note that each of the 'preferred' ('green') locations for housing growth are predominately located adjacent to Whetherby (identified for 7 of the 10 'green' sites) or to the Harewood Ward (identified for 3 of the 10 'green' sites).

1.14 Should allocations follow the Issues and Options analysis then, 2,291 of the total 2,323 'green' housing units will be accommodated on green sites surrounding Whetherby. In contrast just 32 units are to be accommodated on the 'green' sites outside the Whetherby area (i.e. Harewood ward).

1.15 No other settlement centre within the Outer North East contains a 'green' site allocation, which appears imbalanced and inappropriately concentrated on Whetherby

1.16 Although we acknowledge that the amber sites will play an important role in delivering new housing within the outer north-east area, many of these sites potentially have issues which must first be overcome before they can be developed. Not only do these issues introduce timing delays in delivering this housing, it is likely that many of these sites may not be able to overcome their issues and these sites may ultimately fall away.

1.17 Unlike many of the amber sites, Low Mills however is development ready and has no insurmountable constraints which must be overcome before housing can be accommodated.

1.18 If Leeds is to have any success in meeting their housing targets for the Outer North East area, it is critical that more than just two locations are identified as preferred locations for growth.

Representation ID: REP07024      Question Ref: H11

Housing

Phasing (Question H11)

3.1 This section of the report considers the timing of the delivery of housing at Low Mills.

3.2 We can confirm that GMI Holdings Limited are fully funded and fully committed to delivering housing at Low Mills in the short term (i.e. within 0-5 years).

3.3 GMI Holdings Limited have full ownership of the site and the necessary legal agreements are already in place with the adjoining land owners to allow each of the elements of the adjoining 'landscape buffer' to be delivered.

3.4 GMI Holdings Limited is not reliant on the delivery of any significant infrastructure improvements before they can start work on the site. Both the vacant nature of the site and the limited physical site constraints also mean that development could commence in the immediate to short term.

3.5 GMI Holdings Limited have already demonstrated their commitment to delivering this scheme by entering into the necessary legal agreements with the adjoining land owners; investing time and significant resources in researching the current housing market conditions; conducting necessary ecological and traffic surveys; and attending meetings Local Neighbourhood Plan Meetings

Representation ID: REP07488      Question Ref: H1

Housing

H3. Do you think that a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason

Currently, Leeds City Council have not had an opportunity to fully consider the clear potential of this site. The short term opportunities in respect to the delivery of much needed housing in a sustainable location are considerable. This representation sets out why this site is a suitable site for housing. This site should be colour coded green (underlining our emphasis).

See also representation submitted for full details

# General Comments

**Name: GMI Group**

**Representor No: PRS05961**

Representation ID: REP07488      Question Ref: H10

Housing

A red line boundary plan is provided at Appendix 1. The whole site is owned/under option by the GMI Group. This site was not included in the Leeds Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options Document. The site has also not yet been included within the provisions of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).

The site consists of infill land to the south of residential dwellings on Barrowby Lane. The site is bounded to the north by Barrowby Lane, east and south by employment land and west by dwellings at Austhorpe Gardens. The site is currently designated as employment land covered by policies E4(6) and E18(2) in the Leeds UDPR.

There are two major planning permissions covering the development of the Thorpe Park business park. A third major application has been made recently for a mixed retail, commercial, leisure and office development which is in part aimed at helping to fund the Manston Lane Link Road (part of the East Leeds Orbital Road).

Leeds Site Allocations Plan – Issues and Options July 2013

On behalf of GMI Group

Site Reference – Land off Thorpe Park, Austhorpe

Although residential development would result in a small amount of employment land being lost, the arguments in favour of residential development are significant. The arguments are as follows:-

- ☐ The overall adequate supply of employment locally and across Leeds;
- ☐ The relatively slow pace of development at Thorpe Park in recent years and the ample scale of new office development in the northwards expansion; and,
- ☐ The lack of a deliverable 5 year housing land supply.

The site measures 1.3ha and is suitable for the delivery of approximately 14 residential dwellings. The site is accessed from Century Way. The future use of the existing access stub was considered as part of Planning Application 12/00646/FU and although Leeds City Council were happy for Barrowby Lane to be used in that case, Leeds City Council 'Highways' did not raise any concerns in respect to that site being accessed from Thorpe Park. Although site is accessed via Century Way the site is outside the ownership of Thorpe Park.

The Site

The site is approximately 2.6km away from the town of Garforth. In Garforth town centre there are a wide range of shops and services including a supermarket, banks, building societies, estate agents, hairdressers and pubs. In terms of local services, there is a newsagents 400m from the site. Colton Retail Park and Colton Mill are approximately 500m from the site. There are a range of shops and food outlets including a large Sainsburys supermarket.

The site has good access to public transport, education and health facilities. The site is located approximately 1.6km from Cross Gates Railway Station where regular services to Leeds, Bradford, Huddersfield, York and Selby can be accessed. There are bus stops located on Century Way, approximately 260m from the site. The following services can be accessed:

- ☐ 19A – Tinshill to Garforth via Leeds (every 30 minutes)
- ☐ 844 – Leeds to York via Cross Gates, Tadcaster and Copmanthorpe (every 30 minutes)

Leeds Site Allocations Plan – Issues and Options July 2013

On behalf of GMI Group

Site Reference – Land off Thorpe Park, Austhorpe

Bus stops are also located on Selby Road / Ring Road, 400m from the site. The following services can be accessed:

- ☐ 9 – Horsforth to Seacroft via Pudsey, White Rose Centre, Rothwell and Cross Gates (every hour)
- ☐ 163 / 166 – Castleford to Leeds via Kippax, Garforth and Cross Gates (every 15 minutes)
- ☐ 402 / 403 – Selby to Leeds via Micklefield, Garforth and Cross Gates (20 and 55 past the hour)
- ☐ 844 – Leeds to York via Cross Gates, Tadcaster and Copmanthorpe (every 30 minutes)

The site is extremely well placed to access the M1 motorway. Junction 46 is approximately 550m from the site.

The site is close to two primary schools, Austhorpe Primary School, 520m from the site and Colton Primary School, 750m from the site. The nearest secondary schools are, Temple Moor High School Science College, 2.1km away, John Smeaton Community College, 2.1km away and Garforth Academy, 2.6m away.

With regard to health facilities, the nearest GP surgery is Colton Mill Medical Centre 600m away from the site. ADP Dental is 1.4km away from the site in Cross Gates. The nearest pharmacy is at Colton Retail Park 500m away.

The site is well located in respect to other recently approved residential housing developments. Eleven detached dwelling have recently been approved (June 2012) by Leeds City Council to the north of the site.

The site is very close to local employment areas including the Thorpe Park estate.

Policy

The allocation of this site for housing development is consistent with the adopted National Planning Policy Framework. This states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. There are three dimensions to



# General Comments

---

**Name: GMI Group**

**Representor No: PRS05961**

sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. Leeds Site Allocations Plan – Issues and Options July 2013

On behalf of GMI Group

Site Reference – Land off Thorpe Park, Austhorpe

The Framework states that every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. The objectives for the Framework include building a strong competitive economy, promoting sustainable transport and delivering a wide choice of high quality homes.

Draft Core Strategy Spatial Policy 1 Location of Development sets out that to deliver the spatial development strategy based on the Leeds settlement hierarchy it will concentrate the majority of new development within urban areas taking advantage of existing services and high levels of accessibility. This policy states that the urban areas and major settlements will be expected to deliver significant amounts of development, including sustainable extensions.

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.

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 (5%) as extensions. The housing distribution by housing market characteristic area for East Leeds is 11,400 which is 17% of the total housing requirement for the Leeds district.

Conclusions

The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47).

The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and GMI Group.

The site is in a sustainable location and suitable for the delivery of housing as detailed in this response.

Leeds Site Allocations Plan – Issues and Options July 2013

On behalf of GMI Group

Site Reference – Land off Thorpe Park, Austhorpe

There are no insurmountable physical problems or limitations associated with this site 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. It is likely that a planning application will be submitted to Leeds City Council towards the end of 2013 (underlining our emphasis).

Therefore for the reasons set out above, we consider that this site at Austhorpe should be included in the Site Allocations Plan as a housing allocation.

See also representation submitted for full details

Site Plan attached

# General Comments

**Name: A & E Hebditch & Gemmill**

**Representor No: PRS05964**

Representation ID: REP06740      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Our client's site at Long Causeway should have been identified as a green site for reasons outlined in the promotional document and these representations and we do not therefore agree that all the sites identified as green represent the most suitable sites for allocating future housing development.

In addition, there are six sites that are currently allocated for residential development within the North Leeds sub-area. Development has commenced on two of the sites, however the other four sites remain undeveloped. The sites were allocated in 2001 and they should not automatically be allocated in the new Sites Allocations DPD, if there is no planning permission relating to the site, as is the case with site ref: 685. These sites must be reassessed to ensure that they are still deliverable as it is questionable as to why they have not come forward for development.

Full comments, see representation

Representation ID: REP06740      Question Ref: H2

Housing

Our comments in relation to green sites are listed below:

Site 1178A – Land to south of Dunstarn Lane, Adel  
Site Allocations DPD Colour Coding - Green  
Summary – The highways authority have objected to the allocation of the site and it is concluded that access to the site can only be achieved through site 687. Whilst the ownership details of the two sites are unknown, it cannot be guaranteed that this is a viable solution and as such the site would be unachievable. The site should not be allocated until it has been demonstrated that access can be achieved.  
LPA Capacity: 62 BW Assessment: 0

Site 174 – Tetley Hall, Weetwood  
Site Allocations DPD Colour Coding - Green  
Summary – The site has permission for redevelopment of the former halls of residence, granted 2nd August 2012 for a total 114 units comprising 4 storey residential care home, 3 blocks of 54 flats, 2 blocks of 14 townhouses, conversion of stables to detached house, with landscaping and public open space.  
LPA Capacity: 114 BW Assessment: 68  
The site has planning permission for a combination of 114 units. However, of these, 46 are part of a residential care home and these are not market dwellings and they should be deducted from the site capacity. The capacity should therefore be 68.

Site 94 – Sandhill Lane, Moortown  
Site Allocations DPD Colour Coding - Green  
Summary – Has planning permission granted on 5th November 2012 for undeveloped section (two units).  
Work has begun on site.  
4.9 There is an existing planning permission on the site for the construction of two dwellings. The Council confirm that construction of the dwellings has begun. A site which has a yield of only two units should not be considered for allocation.

Site 177 – Broomfield, Adel  
Site Allocations DPD Colour Coding - Green  
Summary – Permission has been granted for demolition of number 54 Broomfield and replacement with 2 dwellings.  
Suitable in principle for residential development.  
LPA Capacity: 5 BW Assessment: 0  
4.10 There is an existing planning permission attached to the site for the demolition of an existing dwelling and the construction of two units. However, the Council have stated a capacity of 5 for this site and it should be reduced as there is a net increase of 1 dwelling across the site. In addition, a site that has a yield of 1 unit should not be considered for allocation.

## Conclusion

4.11 The Council state that there is a capacity of 911 units from green sites. If the above site capacity anomalies are taken into consideration the total capacity should be a maximum of 858.

Full comments see representation

# General Comments

**Name: A & E Hebditch & Gemmill**

**Representor No: PRS05964**

Representation ID: REP06740      Question Ref: H7

Housing

With the exception of our client's site (1079), we would agree that those sites identified as red have been correctly assessed. The vast majority are currently either allocated as greenspace, playing fields or have physical constraints that make the development of the sites unachievable.

Representation ID: REP06740      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Having undertaken assessments of the sites within the North Leeds market area it is clear that in order to meet the Council's housing requirement, green , amber and red sites will be required. The capacity of green sites should be reduced to 796 as not all the site capacities have been calculated correctly; a large proportion of the amber sites are not deliverable and the capacity should be reduced to 998. This means that there will be a requirement for 1,241 units from sites currently identified as red.

Representation ID: REP07275      Question Ref: H2

Housing

The site has permission for redevelopment of the former halls of residence, granted 2nd August 2012 for a total 114 units comprising 4 storey residential care home, 3 blocks of 54 flats, 2 blocks of 14 townhouses, conversion of stables to detached house, with landscaping and public open space.

LPA Capacity: 114  
BW Assessment: 68

The site has planning permission for a combination of 114 units. However, of these, 46 are part of a residential care home and these are not market dwellings and they should be deducted from the site capacity. The capacity should therefore be 68.

Representation ID: REP07275      Question Ref: H2

Housing

Conclusion

4.11 The Council state that there is a capacity of 911 units from green sites. If the above site capacity anomalies are taken into consideration the total capacity should be a maximum of 858.

Representation ID: REP07275      Question Ref: H7

Housing

With the exception of our client's site, we would agree that those sites identified as red have been correctly assessed. The vast majority are currently either allocated as greenspace, playing fields or have physical constraints that make the development of the sites unachievable.

Representation ID: REP07275      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We have assessed the sites within the North Leeds market area and it is clear that a significant number of sites have potential delivery issues and are not considered to be deliverable sites.

4.2 As stated at paragraph 3.6 above the presumed current position is that the residual requirement of 3,035 for the market area can be achieved with green and amber sites and that not all of those identified will be required. Our assessment provides a very different conclusion, which is outlined in table 4.1 below:

LCC Assessment: Green Sites: 911, Barton Willmore Assessment: 796

LCC Assessment: Amber Sites: 2,124, Barton Willmore Assessment:998

LCC Assessment: Red Sites: 0, Barton Willmore Assessment: 1,241

LCC Total: 3,035

Barton Willmore Total: 3,035

The table indicates that the local planning authority are of the opinion that the residual requirement can be achieved without the requirement for any red sites to come forward. However, following our assessment of the sites it is clear that a significant proportion of the amber sites are not deliverable and in order to meet the housing needs of the District, a number of red sites will need to be brought forward.

Our client's site at Long Causeway should have been identified as a green site for reasons outlined in the promotional document and these representations and we do not therefore agree that all the sites identified as green represent the most suitable sites for allocating future housing development.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Templegate Developments Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS05966**

Representation ID: REP06756      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Our client strongly objects to the Council's ranking of the land to the east of Skelton Lake as 2 out of 5 (where 5 is the highest score) for 'accessibility' on the basis that it 'currently fails all accessibility standards'.

3.18 Extensive work has been undertaken by AECOM in relation to transport and highways considerations as referred to in the SDF. This work has concluded that there is no reason why the site should not be allocated for residential use. Good quality access is available to the strategic and local road networks. Importantly, the site has the potential to be served by excellent public transport links. It is considered that accessibility should be assessed on the basis of potential and future accessibility not just the current situation. The SDF clearly demonstrates at page 36 and the accompanying Linkages Plan, that there are a number of potential accessibility options including riverside walks, cycle links and public transport linkages including bus routes. Furthermore, Leeds City Council is proposing a new Park and Ride site in close proximity to Skelton Grange which could be suitably integrated in to the

Background

21353/A5/P1/CH 10 July 2013

public transport strategy for the proposed development at Skelton Grange, thereby assisting in making the Park and Ride viable. Accordingly, it is considered that the site should be ranked at least 4 out of 5 for accessibility.

3.19 Our client also objects to the ranking of the site as 4 out of 5 for 'access' which is presumably due to Council's comments that whilst good vehicular access can be achieved onto Junction 45, 'the opportunity for more than one access point is limited.' Our client objects to this on the basis that (as set out in the SDF), the opportunity exists to utilise an additional second access under the motorway, along Knowsthorpe Lane, to provide a link to the wider Aire Valley. In light of this it is considered that the site should be ranked 5 for this criterion.

3.20 Finally, in terms of the scoring for 'local network' as 4 out of 5, on the basis of 'potential issues at Junction 45 when all Aire Valley built out', our client also objects to this score. The Council has not provided any evidence to support its claim that there would be capacity issues at Junction 45 if and when all of the Aire Valley proposals are built out. Furthermore, as explained at paragraph 3.12 above, the Site already benefits from planning permission for a business park, hotel and supporting retail and leisure uses (Ref: P/32/368/O1/OT) together with planning permission for the layout of access road and landscaping (Ref: P/32/269/01/FU). The Council including its highways authority, have therefore already accepted development at the site. The current scoring, is therefore considered to be unjustified and is unsound. It is our client's view that the site should be ranked 5 for this criterion.

3.21 It is noted that the highways department consider that the land to the east of Skelton Lake is suited to large scale development (as opposed to partial development) on the basis that it would provide greater scope for accessibility improvements.

Representation ID: REP07001      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Skelton Grange site ref: 1295B

Representation ID: REP07001      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

The current document structure of the SAIODPD comprises several volumes of documents and maps containing various information that are saved in a variety of locations on the Council's website; this is considered to be unnecessarily complicated and not user friendly.

---

**Name: Amanda Davis**

**Representor No: PRS05981**

Representation ID: REP06785      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am emailing with strong objection to the number of housing development planned or applied for specifically within the area of Aireborough.

I am a professional person and have chosen to bring my child up in the area I was brought up in. The main reason for this is how green the area is and how thus far this has on the whole been maintained. However, I already have concerns to the safety of the roads in this area (my daughter is 5 years old) and cannot enjoy the same safe childhood I enjoyed in that the roads are already far too busy and congested. In addition, by bringing 'affordable' housing to any area, brings with it characteristics of people not as concerned for the area and environment as Aireborough has had for years and years.

The school my daughter is at achieves good results and was the main reason I moved house less than half a mile to ensure she went to this school. By developing further unnecessary housing, the pressure on these services is going to dramatically increase, and I believe lead to a poorer provision of services as schools and GP's struggle to manage the increase in people living in this area.

This country has plenty of inner city areas far more suitable to 'make good' and provide extra housing without taking what little this city has of green field area. Due to the unfortunate economic climate the country is in, many businesses and factories have now closed and so many buildings or building space is lying in waste when this is a far more suitable option to be considered for building housing on with far less impact on immediate surrounding areas.

I would not usually write such an email, purely because I don't believe the voice of the community is listened to by people in positions such as yourselves, however, the strong reason behind me doing so on this occasion is that maybe this will have an impact for the future environment of my daughter and retain some standards that should not be lost despite greedy developers and government decisions to increase housing in an area that is already full to capacity for the wrong reasons without utilising existing options!

# General Comments

**Name:** Paul Wadsworth

**Representor No:** PRS05982

Representation ID: REP07102      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

In formulating our response to the consultation on the future development of Guiseley & Rawdon Ward we have gradually and over time hardened our original and long held opinion that Aireborough has had enough.

We believe that the principle of Leeds adopting a proper plan of where and when development can take place is basically sound. We are a growing City and want to continue to grow. Growth however must be for the benefit of local populations, not a reason to sacrifice them for the sake of developers who can see only the sites at the end of their collective noses rather than embrace the totality of Leeds. Why can they not rise to the challenge of taking on huge potential development sites of South and South Central Leeds? Sites where it is possible to create a new infrastructure rather than to strain past bursting point an infrastructure already bursting? If not then why did we link the M1 into this area?

The government wants to create a bottom up relationship with localities. It wants people to have some control over how their neighbourhoods develop and where. It wants them to be able to protect local character, to keep and create "places", not surely, to be party to the exact opposite, their destruction.

So, now to Aireborough. Over the last 15/20 years we have seen the gradual destruction of the industrial character of our townships. Factories have been knocked down like ninepins; Parkinson's, Shires, Silver Cross, Peats Mills, Greenwoods, the list goes on; gas and electric sites have gone, so too has our Grammar School, and notably one Hospital (High Royds); Naylor Jennings is going, all for the sake of more and more houses. And more importantly not one jot of improvement to our infrastructure.

Aireborough is defined by one thing, the A65. This road starts in Cumbria and reaches Aireborough via Skipton, Addingham, Burley –in-Wharfedale and then Menston. All these places send their populations to work in Leeds with perhaps a few going into Bradford. Their only route is the A65 and the only changes to that over this period is the addition of pedestrian crossings, traffic lights and a very big island in Guiseley known as the Gyratory. These, do not ease the flow, they slow it. Along this choked road we have built on every available site, and everyone living in these sites has to use the A65 to get anywhere.

All this development has, with the exception of two protected area of search (PAS) Sites, been on Brownfield land. Because of that the effects have been to increase the population without spreading our built boundaries.

What we are now expected to condone is the introduction of a further sixteen hundred (net) houses on Greenfield Sites. Sixteen hundred houses will mean approximately three thousand two hundred people. Those people will drive cars and the only way out of Aireborough is via the A65. To reach that road there will be a strain put onto the, in most cases, very narrow internal roads. Three thousand two hundred people will have quite a lot of children and at present we have local uproar because we do not currently have room in our Primary Schools for the children already here. Nor have we an easy solution to that problem. There is a lack of medical and particularly dental cover now. Parking is a perpetual headache, getting worse by the day. Recently we had two new major stores open in the retail park. This has resulted in vastly increased traffic and at weekends the A65 grinds to a halt.

As if all this is not sufficient, Bradford is likely to build several hundred houses in Derry Hill at Menston. The people living there will be Leeds facing, Bradford means nothing to Menston, so where will they all go? Onto the A65, into our schools, shops, parking spaces and so on.

Over the period of recent development it has been a struggle to get housing that is not just "off the shelf" but bears some relationship to the old townships we live in. Mostly we failed, apart from getting chimneys recognised as a must have. The factories that went were full of character, as was the housing for their workers. That remains, but it is usually at odds with the new build.

As we have said the essential character of Aireborough has been badly damaged but not completely lost. We still have some open space in and around the Townships but the proposals before us leave no area safe. Historic buildings in historic settings could be surrounded by new build, long distance views will disappear. Boundaries will get blurred and local pride will suffer a dreadful blow. Little London Conservation Area could be joined to Nether Yeadon, joined to Westfield Estate. You would probably be able to walk from Horsforth to Menston without seeing a field. Development on the green fields between Netherfield Road and the A65 would be another filling of a buffer gap. And Wills Gill could be another infill which would remove any green fields between Yeadon and Guiseley.

We have had development in spades. We are just about surviving but even without all this prospective building we are struggling. These proposals will change Aireborough forever and not for the benefit of anyone, not even the incomers.

Finally we say Think again, Leeds is a big place, you can find space for 2300 houses (gross) without laying a finger on Aireborough. Please do it.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Peter Surtees**

**Representor No: PRS05986**

Representation ID: REP06798      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Building developments in North Leeds

I am aware that there is a need for more housing in Leeds and that 8000 – 9000 are needed in the Northern part of Leeds to serve the growing population. What deeply concerns me regarding the development of land at \_\_\_\_\_ is that there is no provision for building other than for housing development. This will undoubtedly mean more pressure on the already inadequate and outdated infrastructure.

Roads

Residents complain of cut through traffic speeding along estate roads. What is being done to improve the main arterial and ring roads? The increased population will need a significant number of new jobs. How can we expect economy growth in Leeds with a poor road network?

Shops

I understand that the planners/councillors do not want another corner shop arrangement similar to the Adel post office/mini market. This is a continual source of congestion due to inadequate parking. This will only get busier. Consideration should be given to the concept of running a service road parallel to the Otley Road along the front of Bodington hall and the government land with some suitable shops and parking to serve the passing trade.

D1 use

Schools

The local primary schools are oversubscribed. Children already have to travel out of the area to get a place. What is being done to provide extra places in the area?

Places of worship/community centres

Local governments are striving to create and maintain stable and caring communities. How can this be achieved when there is no provision made for D1 use?

My concern perhaps could be summed up:

1. That there is a total lack of overall planning in the north Leeds area.

2. That, if planning approval is granted for these huge areas of housing without consideration for other needs to serve the larger population, we will have effectively created a poor quality area which will be unattractive for people to live.

3. Future provision for D1 use and improved road network will be difficult to add later as there has been no fore thought for these essential needs.

---

**Name: And And Martin Oldfield**

**Representor No: PRS05989**

Representation ID: REP06804      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Objection to proposed building of houses in Aireborough - Plot Nos. 1221 Gill Lane

We wish to object to the proposed building of houses on the above plots of land for the following reasons.

. Loss of Green belt - First consideration must be given to Brown field sites. Building on fields may be lucrative for the Council and housing developers but it will destroy what little countryside and wildlife there is left in this area. It will also promote the continuing merging of Leeds & Bradford.

. Highways - The roads already cannot cope with the volume of traffic with both the A65 and Apperley Lane often at a standstill at rush hour. If 767 new houses each have 2 cars that is an extra 1534 cars. Plus the building of Apperley Bridge train station could add to the volume of traffic using the local roads.

. Lack of facilities - are there plans to build more doctors and dental surgeries?

. Heritage - any development of these green fields will have an everlasting effect on the area and on any listed buildings and on the conservation area of Little London.

---

**Name: The Eastern Extension North Quadrant Consortium**

**Representor No: PRS06005**

Representation ID: REP06808      Question Ref: H4

Housing

Some of the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for future housing development as they are sites with issues which the Council does not have sufficient information to determine whether the issues identified can be resolved.

The eastern boundary of site 797 (allocation) follows the UDP Green Belt boundary. This boundary was drawn in the late 1980's and was intended to indicate the line of the ELOR. However, the line was not based on any topographical or technical analysis and has created practical difficulties for its delivery. In the interests of efficient use of land and infrastructure opportunity should be created to adjust the line of the ELOR as well as allowing the possibility of additional residential development, dependant on the final routing of the ELOR. The North Quadrant site can be delivered prior to the delivery of the ELOR.

In addition, the allocation boundary north of Skelton's Lane runs directly through the Bramley Grange Farm building complex (an example of the lack of detail consideration in defining the UDP allocation boundary. A minor amendment in the boundary would avoid the building complex being affected by the construction of ELOR and has the potential for housing dependent on the final routing of the East Leeds Orbital Road.

See also representation submitted for full details

# General Comments

---

**Name: Cornforth And Sons**

**Representor No: PRS06008**

Representation ID: REP06833      Question Ref: H14

Housing

Bardsey Neighbourhood Steering Group have undertaken a Housing Needs Survey for their settlement, and identified a need for 1st time buyers housing and housing for residents looking to downsize, this may include housing for the elderly. We are keen to work with residents of Bardsey and Leeds City Council in identifying the right mix of housing for the site.

---

**Name: Muse Developments**

**Representor No: PRS06011**

Representation ID: REP06837      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Please accept this correspondence as a formal representation to the current consultation for the Draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).  
We act on behalf of Muse Developments who own land at Skelton Moor Farm (known as "Logic Leeds"). This site falls within the boundary of the Aire Valley Area Action Plan (AAP). For the avoidance of doubt, the Aire Valley APP Proposals Map refers to the site as "5B.1".  
It is noted in Volume 1 of the Draft Site Allocations DPD that the Council is not including sites within the Aire Valley AAP through the current consultation on the Draft Site Allocations DPD. Representations on these sites will be subject to a separate consultation process. We have been advised by David Feeney that if we wish to make Aire Valley site specific representations we should do so through the consultation process for the Aire Valley AAP which we understand is expected to take place in October.  
The purpose of this correspondence is to formally note that in the event that the Aire Valley AAP process does not continue or does not make cross reference to matters set out in detail in the current document, we reserve the right to make consultations to the Draft Site Allocations DPD for our client's site at Logic Leeds, Skelton Moor Farm.  
If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

---

**Name: V P Cunningham**

**Representor No: PRS06020**

Representation ID: REP06850      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I live on Mawcroft Close, Yeadon, which is at the junction of the A65 and A658. I have lived here for some 29 years and in that time have seen the traffic quadruple. The noise from the traffic is horrendous and no one can sleep in the back bedroom or leave windows open at night during the hot weather. It is almost impossible to turn right out of the estate towards the JCT roundabout without taking your life in your hands due to the oncoming traffic as for some reason the airport traffic has been diverted down the A658 instead of going straight up the Harrogate Road. During the rush hours the traffic is extremely congested, the buses are full and the trains impossible to get on due to overcrowding. The doctor's surgeries are so full that you have to wait a fortnight to see a doctor of your choice. The schools are also full to capacity and the roads round here are full of parked cars, even using the main road, Quakers Lane, Green Lane and our estate as car parks. The drains cannot cope with volume and the one at the bottom of our road near to Warm Lane, floods every time it rains.  
I now learn with distress that planning permission has been granted for 752 houses near to us and that you are looking at green fields to build more than another 1500. I am afraid that the infrastructure will not stand the extra population and how much more traffic can you put on the A65? Please look at other alternatives for building apart from the easy prey of green belt as it is getting impossible to live on this road.

# General Comments

**Name:** Dobson

**Representor No:** PRS06034

Representation ID: REP06868      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Mr Dobson considers that the Greenfield Produce site, at Lofthouse (Outer South) should be included within the Allocations Issues and Options document as removed from the Green Belt and allocated as a site with greatest potential to be allocated for housing. Please see attached site details.

NPPF Tests of soundness

Paragraph 182 states:

The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is “sound” – namely that it is: Positively prepared, Justified, Effective and Consistent with national policy.

Justification

The site currently constitutes two large vacant industrial units, which were previously the premises of Greenfield Produce. It is therefore a brownfield site, located within the green belt. The site is located within the urban fringe of Lofthouse.

The site is within private ownership and is available for development in the short term. Access is available and can be taken from Ouzelwell Green. There are no known constraints to the development of the site. The site is in a sustainable location with access to local shops and services in Lofthouse and surrounding residential areas. Public transport links are also easily accessible along Ouzelwell Green, providing access to Wakefield.

The physical context of the site lends itself to residential redevelopment; the site is roughly rectangular in shape with a frontage to Ouzelwell Lane. To the west of the site is an established residential area; with a frontage to Ouzelwell Lane, and therefore the development of residential properties on the site would be an appropriate continuation of the existing urban form in the area. Furthermore the development of the site and removal of the existing redundant warehouse units would constitute a significant visual amenity improvement in the area.

As set out within the National Planning Policy Guidance document, (paragraph 89), development in the Green Belt should be considered inappropriate, except for

‘limited infilling, or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land) whether redundant or in continuing use, which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development’

The proposal for the redevelopment of the site for residential use is therefore considered to be in keeping with the principles of the NPPF. The site is brownfield and would constitute an infill development. The removal of these units and redevelopment of the site for residential use would reduce the visual impact of the site on the Greenbelt, improve visual amenity through the removal of the large warehouses and increase the openness in the area. Furthermore, the development would have no greater impact on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, than the existing development. A residential development at the site would reduce scale and massing of development at the site. Any residential development could include a substantial landscaping scheme, in order to ensure that the development is screened from the wider area and to protect and retain the openness of the green belt.

At present the site does not perform any Green Belt function and as set out within the NPPF Paragraph 85 land green belt boundaries should not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open. The green belt boundary should therefore be re-drawn around the edge of the site. The removal of the site from the Green Belt could allow for the formation of new and robust Green Belt boundary.

Furthermore, the site could be considered in conjunction with the adjacent site (ref: 1261) as a comprehensive development area. The Greenfield Produce site can provide access into the larger site. This comprehensive development could provide a significant number of dwellings and would constitute an infill plot, providing a new robust and long term green belt boundary along the M62 motorway.

Proposed Change

The Greenfield Produce site at Ouzelwell Green, Lofthouse, should be identified within the plan as a green site as having ‘greatest potential to be allocated for housing’.

See also representation submitted for full details

Site Plan attached



# General Comments

**Name:** Dobson

**Representor No:** PRS06034

Representation ID: REP06868

Question Ref: H10

Housing

Mr Dobson considers that the Greenfield Produce site, at Lofthouse (Outer South) should be included within the Allocations Issues and Options document as removed from the Green Belt and allocated as a site with greatest potential to be allocated for housing. Please see attached site details.

NPPF Tests of soundness

Paragraph 182 states:

The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is “sound” – namely that it is: Positively prepared, Justified, Effective and Consistent with national policy.

Justification

The site currently constitutes two large vacant industrial units, which were previously the premises of Greenfield Produce. It is therefore a brownfield site, located within the green belt. The site is located within the urban fringe of Lofthouse.

The site is within private ownership and is available for development in the short term. Access is available and can be taken from Ouzelwell Green. There are no known constraints to the development of the site. The site is in a sustainable location with access to local shops and services in Lofthouse and surrounding residential areas. Public transport links are also easily accessible along Ouzelwell Green, providing access to Wakefield.

The physical context of the site lends itself to residential redevelopment; the site is roughly rectangular in shape with a frontage to Ouzelwell Lane. To the west of the site is an established residential area; with a frontage to Ouzelwell Lane, and therefore the development of residential properties on the site would be an appropriate continuation of the existing urban form in the area. Furthermore the development of the site and removal of the existing redundant warehouse units would constitute a significant visual amenity improvement in the area.

As set out within the National Planning Policy Guidance document, (paragraph 89), development in the Green Belt should be considered inappropriate, except for 'limited infilling, or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land) whether redundant or in continuing use, which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it that the existing development'

The proposal for the redevelopment of the site for residential use is therefore considered to be in keeping with the principles of the NPPF. The site is brownfield and would constitute an infill development. The removal of these units and redevelopment of the site for residential use would reduce the visual impact of the site on the Greenbelt, improve visual amenity through the removal of the large warehouses and increase the openness in the area. Furthermore, the development would have no greater impact on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, than the existing development. A residential development at the site would reduce scale and massing of development at the site. Any residential development could include a substantial landscaping scheme, in order to ensure that the development is screened from the wider area and to protect and retain the openness of the green belt.

At present the site does not perform any Green Belt function and as set out within the NPPF Paragraph 85 land green belt boundaries should not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open. The green belt boundary should therefore be re-drawn around the edge of the site. The removal of the site from the Green Belt could allow for the formation of new and robust Green Belt boundary.

Furthermore, the site could be considered in conjunction with the adjacent site (ref: 1261) as a comprehensive development area. The Greenfield Produce site can provide access into the larger site. This comprehensive development could provide a significant number of dwellings and would constitute an infill plot, providing a new robust and long term green belt boundary along the M62 motorway.

Proposed Change

The Greenfield Produce site at Ouzelwell Green, Lofthouse, should be identified within the plan as a green site as having 'greatest potential to be allocated for housing'.

See also representation submitted for full details

Site Plan attached

# General Comments

**Name:** Dobson

**Representor No:** PRS06034

Representation ID: REP07362      Question Ref: H3

Housing

We consider that the site at Sharpe Farm, Middleton (SHLAA 3738) should have been included within the Leeds Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options as a Green site, for future housing development.

## NPPF Tests of soundness

### Justification

The site at Sharpe Farm, Middleton provides an opportunity for the delivery of new residential dwellings, providing new homes to meet the significant need within Leeds, and complementing the residential development and regeneration already taking place within the Middleton area. The site is within one private ownership and is available for development in the short term. Access is available and can be taken from Sharpe House Road, to the northwest of the site. There are no known constraints to the development of the site. The site is suitable for residential development, it is located in an area which is currently being developed for significant numbers of residential units and so could be seen as an opportunity to consolidate and 'round off' the urban edge in this area. The site is in a suitable location and is within accessible distance of local shops and services in Middleton centre. It is also within accessible distance of public transport facilities within Middleton area as well as the highways network providing links to the M1.

The site details form attached shows an indicative layout, demonstrating that a layout could be achieved which would respect the urban form already developed in the area, with residential development proposed to the north of the site, adjacent to the existing development area. The proposal also provides the opportunity to install linkages through the proposal site, from the newly developed residential area and beyond. The site is bounded to the northeast, east and south by dense areas of existing trees, and therefore here is potential for a new robust green belt boundary to be developed along these boundaries. The development of the site for residential use would not affect the Green Belt or the purpose of including the land in the green belt, and would consolidate the new residential development in this area.

The site is located adjacent to Sharpe Lane, in Middleton, approximately 6km south of Leeds city centre and 3k west of Morley. The M1 motorway is located close to the east of the site. The site is approximately 3ha in size and is primarily flat land. It is currently in use for agriculture. The site is bounded to the east by a significant area of trees, which screen the site from the M1 motorway, which runs north to south. To the south of there are further trees and beyond this is further open agricultural land. To the north the site adjoins Sharpe Lane, and Sharpe House Road, which leads into a large area of new residential development to the northeast. To the west of the site is an area of open land which is designated open space for the residential development to the northwest.

**AVAILABILITY** - Available: A site is considered available for housing, when, on the best information available, there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership problems.

**Ownership and Land Availability** - The site is in the private ownership of Mr Simon Dobson, and is available for development, with no legal constraints.

**SUITABILITY** - The site is considered to be in a suitable location for development. It is in a sustainable location in close proximity to a significant residential development, which is currently under construction to the northwest. The site is well screened by trees to the east.

**Planning Status** - At present the site is allocated within the Leeds Unitary Development Plan as within the Green Belt, and within the Urban Fringe Priority area. The site is in sustainable location, in close proximity to Middleton centre, and within accessible distance of public transport infrastructure and highways links to the M1 motorway. The development of the residential site to the northwest is identified within the Leeds UDP as 'Sharpe Lane strategic housing site', and the plan states that the development can 'consolidating redevelopment in Middleton, and underpinning the enhancement of Middleton District Centre, and bringing benefits to a much wider local community'. The proposed development of the site and therefore provide an additional benefit to the local area and a consolidation of the physical context of residential properties in this area.

**ACHIEVABILITY** - The site is considered to be an achievable prospect for housing delivery. The land is in single ownership, and access is available. There are no known technical constraints to its delivery for housing.

**The Vision** - To provide a high quality mixed development of housing to meet local needs. The proposal can complement existing residential development in the area and assist with regeneration of Middleton. The proposal can provide a new robust green belt boundary.

[See representation for design principles plan]. It shows the potential for a residential development at the site. Properties could be located to the north of the site, in order to maintain the urban form of the existing residential development to the north. Open space can be located to the southern end of the site, with linkages being developed to existing footpaths to the east and west. Access can be taken from Sharpe House Lane, to the northwest of the site.

## KEY BENEFITS –

**Economic Benefit** - Employment opportunities through construction phase Increased investment and expenditure in local shops and services. New Homes Bonus will provide a financial contribution to Leeds City Council. Proposal will assist with regeneration of Middleton area.

**Social Benefits** - The site provides an opportunity to deliver residential development in a highly sustainable location The development will provide 14 dwellings increasing supply of housing in the local area

**Environmental Benefit** - New open space area will provide publically accessible space Proposal will provide a high quality landscaping scheme

# General Comments

---

**Name: Dobson**

**Representor No: PRS06034**

Representation ID: REP07362      Question Ref: H10

Housing

We consider that the site at Sharpe Farm, Middleton (SHLAA 3738) should have been included within the Leeds Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options as a Green site, for future housing development.

## NPPF Tests of soundness

### Justification

The site at Sharpe Farm, Middleton provides an opportunity for the delivery of new residential dwellings, providing new homes to meet the significant need within Leeds, and complementing the residential development and regeneration already taking place within the Middleton area. The site is within one private ownership and is available for development in the short term. Access is available and can be taken from Sharpe House Road, to the northwest of the site. There are no known constraints to the development of the site. The site is suitable for residential development, it is located in an area which is currently being developed for significant numbers of residential units and so could be seen as an opportunity to consolidate and 'round off' the urban edge in this area. The site is in a suitable location and is within accessible distance of local shops and services in Middleton centre. It is also within accessible distance of public transport facilities within Middleton area as well as the highways network providing links to the M1.

The site details form attached shows an indicative layout, demonstrating that a layout could be achieved which would respect the urban form already developed in the area, with residential development proposed to the north of the site, adjacent to the existing development area. The proposal also provides the opportunity to install linkages through the proposal site, from the newly developed residential area and beyond. The site is bounded to the northeast, east and south by dense areas of existing trees, and therefore here is potential for a new robust green belt boundary to be developed along these boundaries. The development of the site for residential use would not affect the Green Belt or the purpose of including the land in the green belt, and would consolidate the new residential development in this area.

The site is located adjacent to Sharpe Lane, in Middleton, approximately 6km south of Leeds city centre and 3k west of Morley. The M1 motorway is located close to the east of the site. The site is approximately 3ha in size and is primarily flat land. It is currently in use for agriculture. The site is bounded to the east by a significant area of trees, which screen the site from the M1 motorway, which runs north to south. To the south of there are further trees and beyond this is further open agricultural land. To the north the site adjoins Sharpe Lane, and Sharpe House Road, which leads into a large area of new residential development to the northeast. To the west of the site is an area of open land which is designated open space for the residential development to the northwest.

**AVAILABILITY** - Available: A site is considered available for housing, when, on the best information available, there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership problems.

**Ownership and Land Availability** - The site is in the private ownership of Mr Simon Dobson, and is available for development, with no legal constraints.

**SUITABILITY** - The site is considered to be in a suitable location for development. It is in a sustainable location in close proximity to a significant residential development, which is currently under construction to the northwest. The site is well screened by trees to the east.

**Planning Status** - At present the site is allocated within the Leeds Unitary Development Plan as within the Green Belt, and within the Urban Fringe Priority area. The site is in sustainable location, in close proximity to Middleton centre, and within accessible distance of public transport infrastructure and highways links to the M1 motorway. The development of the residential site to the northwest is identified within the Leeds UDP as 'Sharpe Lane strategic housing site', and the plan states that the development can 'consolidating redevelopment in Middleton, and underpinning the enhancement of Middleton District Centre, and bringing benefits to a much wider local community'. The proposed development of the site and therefore provide an additional benefit to the local area and a consolidation of the physical context of residential properties in this area.

**ACHIEVABILITY** - The site is considered to be an achievable prospect for housing delivery. The land is in single ownership, and access is available. There are no known technical constraints to its delivery for housing.

**The Vision** - To provide a high quality mixed development of housing to meet local needs. The proposal can complement existing residential development in the area and assist with regeneration of Middleton. The proposal can provide a new robust green belt boundary.

[See representation for design principles plan]. It shows the potential for a residential development at the site. Properties could be located to the north of the site, in order to maintain the urban form of the existing residential development to the north. Open space can be located to the southern end of the site, with linkages being developed to existing footpaths to the east and west. Access can be taken from Sharpe House Lane, to the northwest of the site.

## KEY BENEFITS –

**Economic Benefit** - Employment opportunities through construction phase Increased investment and expenditure in local shops and services. New Homes Bonus will provide a financial contribution to Leeds City Council. Proposal will assist with regeneration of Middleton area.

**Social Benefits** - The site provides an opportunity to deliver residential development in a highly sustainable location The development will provide 14 dwellings increasing supply of housing in the local area

**Environmental Benefit** - New open space area will provide publically accessible space Proposal will provide a high quality landscaping scheme

---

**Name: Chris & Karen Walters**

**Representor No: PRS06035**

Representation ID: REP06866      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I believe there are numerous 'Brown Field' sites within the Leeds Boundary that could be developed without losing precious 'GreenBelt' land.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Geoff A Black**

**Representor No: PRS06037**

Representation ID: REP06871      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Please note and record my vehement objections to the recent proposals in connection with building new housing in Aireborough on the grounds of:

**1) LOSS OF GREEN BELT**

To build on existing Green Belt land is a serious detriment and a great disservice to the existing community and to future generations. The Green Belt provides the recreational spaces and natural fresh air opportunities for local citizens and must be preserved. Even the "Naylor Jennings" site on Green Lane (appropriate name) should be returned to Green Belt in the form of a landscaped park similar to Nunroyd Park near Guiseley.

**2) EXCESSIVE TRAFFIC CONGESTION**

Already well over capacity, the existing roads are extremely busy and in a deteriorating state of repair. Additional housing, even on a fraction of the scale proposed, would exacerbate the situation and increase the likelihood of traffic accidents, exhaust pollution, traffic congestion and risk to safety of pedestrians.

**3) REDUCED QUALITY OF LOCAL SERVICES**

The introduction of housing on the scale and in the locations proposed will have an enormously adverse impact on the performance of local schools (class sizes), health services (GP waiting times), Council run services (refuse collection and disposal), police and fire services (response times) together with statutory utilities (more service interruptions, more roadworks, temporary diversions, traffic controls, delays and congestion)

**4) ILL-CONCEIVED POLITICAL QUICK FIXES**

House building will NOT kick start the UK economy. When promoted by desperate governments it will serve only to line the pockets of vested interests eg. developers, estate agents, building contractors, consultants etc. and the majority of new jobs created will be short term. The government needs to build businesses across the whole economy not just the construction related sector.

Housing should be:

- determined locally and democratically
- in Aireborough, be in small dispersed locations
- built under the financial control and to the quality and procurement standards of the Local Authority to ensure best value
- built for rental tenure
- designed to respect the existing environment

National and local politicians must consider the long term future of our communities and act strongly to ensure that existing environmental benefits are protected and enhanced so that the legacy left for future generations is of a high and sustainable quality.

---

**Name: Michael Harrison**

**Representor No: PRS06042**

Representation ID: REP06880      Question Ref: H4

Housing

Firstly I find it amazing our council can ever consider building more houses in Churwell when the facilities such as schools, doctors, are already over full capacity.

The traffic in Churwell is already at dangerous levels. The roads in and around Churwell are already over the capacity they can cope with.

Churwell is a village, let us keep it that way otherwise it will just become an extension of Leeds city centre.

I also feel there is no demand for more houses in Churwell. The fact LCC is even considering these sites tells me LCC is not considering the feelings of its residents and its repairs to roads, etc is already a great let down. Totally I am in disagreement with any of these sites for the above reasons.

---

**Name: L. A. Denton**

**Representor No: PRS06043**

Representation ID: REP06882      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

4.Finally although accepting that houses will have to be built, the plan offers no solution to the already overcrowded roads, particularly the A65, and to try and feed in further traffic to either Leeds or Bradford will only add to the chaos. There are now no substantial employers in the area and public transport at peak times is overloaded, with the problem of car parking for the station being a paramount concern. Park Road is also the heavy goods route from the Bradford road to the Leeds road, which raises further concerns about feeding more domestic traffic on to Park Road at any time.

I am a local resident, and a Junior School Governor, which means the extra housing raises other concerns.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Josie Madden**

**Representor No: PRS06051**

Representation ID: REP05746      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

From: Josie Madden

From: Josie Madden

To: LDF Leeds

Subject: Site 3455A - Gamble Lane Farnley & Site 3455B – Gamble Lane, Farnley

Date: 29 July 2013 08:46:20

Dear sirs,

Leeds Local Development Framework

Site Allocations Plan consultation

July 2013

Background

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 Land 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

---

**Name: Jonathan Westwood**

**Representor No: PRS06056**

Representation ID: REP06901      Question Ref: H11

Housing

It is acknowledged that it is the Council's preference to release Green Belt sites for housing in the later stages of the Plan period (this is set out in the Draft Core Strategy Policy H1). However, sites such as 1209 [\*\* should be 1029\*\*], which constitutes infill development; would not have a negative impact on the Green Belt; can assimilate into its surroundings with relative ease, and; is in a sustainable location, should come forward within the initial phase of the Plan period. Doing so would make a positive contribution to the 5 year housing land supply and delivery of housing in the Outer South West Area.

To this end, and in response to question H11, we suggest that site 1209 is included within Phase 1 of the Plan period and is released for housing in years 0 – 5 of the Plan.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Shinn**

**Representor No: PRS06058**

Representation ID: REP06903      Question Ref: H10

Housing

New Site

Please find attached our representation on behalf of the Shinn family, submitted on the current consultation for the Leeds City Council Site Allocations Plan – Issues and Options with regards to our clients existing employment site, Rakehill Road Industrial Site, Barwick in Elmet.

The focus of this submission is to request that the site is assessed by the Council for its suitability for a housing allocation, in response to the 'call for sites' request under Question H10: "Do you think there are other more suitable sites not shown on the plan that could be considered for future housing allocations?".

The site is an existing industrial site which lies within and adjacent to the settlement boundary of Barwick in Elmet at the north west corner of the village. It is currently occupied by a large range of industrial buildings as well as a significant area of associated hardstanding. The site is visually well contained by a thick tree belt to all sides.

Despite the sites previously developed nature and industrial character, the site is also included within the schedule for the adjacent Ancient Scheduled Monument on Hall Tower Hill. We believe the sites sensitive redevelopment for a less intensive use i.e. a small scale residential use would have less harmful impact on the adjacent scheduled ancient monument than the current industrial use. It would also be considered a more sensitive use for the adjacent conservation area and the removal of heavy goods vehicles from the local narrow roads would improve highway safety and general access in the area. The removal of industry from the site would also improve residential amenities of those occupying adjacent existing dwellings.

Demand for the employment units on the site has fallen steadily over the last few decades and the owners now feel that the land could be better utilised to address housing need in the area. It is considered that due to the sites location and its existing significant tree screening etc that it would be a less intrusive way of delivering additional housing in the village than the sites currently being considered through the consultation. The site would be available in the short term for development however the owner is willing to engage with the council on phasing the delivery of the site to meet the strategic delivery needs of the Council.

Please find enclosed a red edge plan/aerial photo showing the area of land we would like submitting and considering as part of your current consultation. In the near future a draft scheme will be developed in consultation with the Council's planning department to demonstrate how the site could be sensitively delivered with no harm to the adjacent scheduled ancient monument or wider Barwick in Elmet conservation area.

We would be most grateful for acknowledgement of receipt of this letter and accompanying documents and assurance of future notification of development plan process events/notifications/consultations.

See also representation submitted for full details

Site Plan attached

---

**Name: Angela Utley**

**Representor No: PRS06062**

Representation ID: REP06910      Question Ref: E4

Employment

As for commercial sites, they could be in the area north of Lotherton way and Ash Lane, the old A&E turbines site and as far as Hawks Nest Wood where there are several brown field sites that desperately need further improvement and development. Some of these areas may be suitable for mixed use.

# General Comments

**Name:** Marcus Little  
**Representor No:** PRS06072

Representation ID: REP06923      Question Ref: H10      Housing

I submitted the attached report to the Council last September but it does not appear to have been assessed by the Council in the current round of consultation. As such, I now submit it again for consideration as a housing site.  
I look forward to receiving acknowledgement that you have received the report and that it will be assessed as a housing site.  
[See scanned representation for full submission]

# General Comments

**Name: Marcus Little**

**Representor No: PRS06072**

Representation ID: REP06923      Question Ref: H10

Housing

## INTRODUCTION

1.1 We have been instructed to submit this representation on behalf of our client Mr Marcus Little in respect of pursuing a positive land allocation for residential development in the Leeds Sites Allocations Development Plan Document on land to the west of Bay Horse Lane, Scarcroft ("the Site"- see Appendix I).

1.2 In addition to this report, my clients have also commissioned the following additional assessments:

- Highways Assessment by Bryan G Hall Consulting Civil and Transportation Planning Engineers- Appendix 2.
- Ecology Assessment by Brooks Ecological- Appendix 3.

## 2 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 The Site lies to the west of Scarcroft and is bound to the north-west by Moor Allerton Golf Club, to the east by existing residential development and to the south- west by open fields. The whole Site currently lies in a wider area of Green Belt.

2.2 The Site is currently being used for horse grazing, along side existing residential development and an employment use. The annotated plan at Appendix 4 provides more detail.

## 3 AUDIT OF RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 Planning permission was granted for a detached horse shelter in 2010 (ref: I 0/02392/FU)

3.2 Planning permission granted for change of use from a riding arena to offices in 2002 (ref: 33/132/02/FU).

## 4 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL AND DELIVERABILITY

4.1 The Site measures 4 ha with the developable area measuring 2.2 ha. My clients would be seeking to accommodate approximately 25 dwellings on the Site to reflect the character and density of the surrounding area however, it is an indicative figure at this stage.

4.2 An appropriate amount of affordable housing will be provided within the scheme that will be reflective of the Council's policy and proven need at the time an application is submitted.

4.3 The Transport Assessment completed by Bryan G Hall Consulting Engineers shows that access can successfully be gained from Bay Horse Lane.

4.4 The Ecology Report prepared by Brooks Ecological can find no evidence of protected flora or fauna on the site to prohibit development.

4.5 The Site is greenfield and in terms of policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework ("the NPPF"),

## 5 PLANNING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 The NPPF states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. For plan making this means that local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area.

5.2 Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that: "To boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area"

5.3 Scarcroft lies in the Outer North East Housing Market Area as stated in Spatial Policy 7 of the Leeds Core Strategy (Publication), 2012. This policy states that there is a need to supply 5000 new dwellings over the plan period in this Housing Market Area. The site being proposed to be developed for new housing can go some way to meeting that need.

5.4 Paragraph 47 also seeks to ensure that sites are available now, suitable for development, and development can be achieved on the site within 5 years of the date of adoption of the DPD. We consider that this is the case in terms of the delivery of homes on our client's site.

5.5 In terms of the sustainability of the Site, it is true that Scarcroft is not home to many services and facilities. However, an Inspector concluded in a recent planning appeal decision ( Land off Syke Lane, Scarcroft, Leeds APP/N4720/A/ 10/2132150 1 February 2012) that "whilst there are instances of long trips to schools, and journeys to nearby villages are likely to be by car, I am not convinced that the sustainability credentials of Scarcroft are so poor that they should be the determining and decisive matter in the consideration of this appeal". As was set out above, there is a need to provide new homes, both market and affordable across the Outer North East Housing Market Area. To deny Scarcroft some homes would not be meeting the needs of the community where the sustainability credentials are not considered to be that poor.

5.6 The Site lies in the Green Belt and as such regard must be had to section 9 of the NPPF.

5.7 Paragraph 80 sets out the five purposes that the Green Belt serves:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- To prevent neighbouring towns from 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.

5.8 Spatial Policy 10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (Publication) 2012, states that a selective review of the Green Belt will be needed to be carried out to accommodate the scale of new housing growth to meet the identified need. The review will be focussed on the main urban areas and major settlements but sites in other settlements could be considered where they are in sustainable locations.

5.9 As such, we consider that taking the site out of the Green Belt will not conflict with the five purposes:

- The development of the Site for housing will not protrude into the open countryside. The Site is well screened along Tam Lane, Bay Horse Lane and Ling Lane and is already host to residential and employment development. The well-established boundaries to the Site can be seen below
- The development of the Site will not lead to neighbouring towns merging. The Site is located adjacent to the existing settlement boundary of Scarcroft with the next nearest settlement being some distance from the site.
- We consider that the changes which would arise as a consequence of the development of the Site would not be unacceptably adverse and would not be sufficient to prohibit the principle of development.
- Scarcroft is not an identified Historic Town. There is a Conservation Area defined in Scarcroft but it is located to the east of the A 58 and the development of the Site will not impact on its setting or any heritage asset.
- The fact that the Core Strategy has identified that Green Belt land is required in order to meet the housing targets would suggest that even with all the previously developed land being proposed for future development, there is still a requirement to find more land to meet the housing need. This would lead to the need to develop land that is adjacent to existing settlements in the first instance.

## 6 LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT

6.1 Whilst the Site is located within the Green Belt, it is not covered by any special landscape policies as is the case with the land to the north and south of the settlement see Appendix 5 for a copy of the Leeds UDP Proposals map.

6.2 A Conservation Area exists in Scarcroft to the east of the A58- see Appendix 6.



# General Comments

---

**Name: Marcus Little**

**Representor No: PRS06072**

[See scanned document for full submission – photos and appendices]

---

**Name: Barry Hamblin**

**Representor No: PRS06078**

Representation ID: REP07047

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This weekend, it has come to our attention, via a distant neighbour/relative, might I add, regarding the proposed building of 670 houses within a square mile of JCT roundabout in Rawdon, Leeds. Why were we not notified independently? AS we understand 30 houses have already been granted permission, following the recent building of the Foxglove estate within this area. Green Lane itself is already under further threat to have houses built on the pond behind the mill, which is also in dispute with house holders within that area, and thus adding more congestion.

Firstly, we have lived close to the JCT roundabout for approximately 35 years. During this time we have seen a decline in public services, road conditions, manholes collapsing, excess of speeding vehicles through the estates to AVOID the JCT roundabout to access the A65 towards Skipton, and the A65 towards Leeds/Bradford Airport, and Leeds City Centre. Green Lane, Warm Lane, Quaker Lane, which are all in the immediate vicinity of JCT roundabout has now become a car park for the new EMIS offices, causing a bottle neck around this area already. Therefore, we can estimate of a further 1340 vehicles (2 per household), adding to this already congested area. That would be a further 2680 people (average of 4 per household) plus pets, adding to the overcrowded woodland area of Esholt Woods, used as a dog toilet.

The Fire Station on Green Lane has been closed. It is impossible to obtain a Doctor's appointment within 3 days. Schools are bursting at the seams resulting in a poor standard. Benton Park school has declined in its standards over the years. The impact on obtaining local jobs in this area would be negative, as it is proving difficult at the moment. The condition of the roads in the area are appalling which would only become worse with the extra envisaged traffic. There are no local shops/newsagents/mini markets to service this area, everyone has to drive everywhere. Emergency services are already stretched, and this would cause a good deal of extra workload on the declining Emergency Services we are currently enduring and has to be fully operational for Leeds/Bradford Airport.

Warm Lane already has buses going up and down it, which causes other road users to mount the kerb to allow the buses through as it is not wide enough for them to travel freely. This itself is dangerous, especially when school children use this as a route to the Benton Park, and Rawdon Littlemoor Schools.

We pride ourselves on living in a rural area, yet close to amenities, surely there has to be a solution to STOP this building, it will have a NEGATIVE effect on the community with a potential of crime increasing.

We write to you to OBJECT and protect our GREEN BELT. Where would all the animals, birds and wildlife survive?

# General Comments

---

**Name: John Davies**

**Representor No: PRS06079**

Representation ID: REP06933      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Dear Mr Crabtree,

I write to express my concerns at the development proposals for the Rawdon area around Warm Lane in particular and the Aireborough area more generally on greenbelt land. I have copied this email to our local M.P's and ward councillors as well to make them aware of my concerns and that of every local resident that I have spoken to.

Our concerns centre on the loss of valuable green space in what is becoming increasingly a characterless urban sprawl. Local roads, in particular Apperley Lane at the end of Princess St, suffer already from considerable congestion at peak times. Apperley Lane is a relatively narrow road for the amount of traffic that it is expected to carry. Further residential development on the scale being contemplated will only serve to massively exacerbate this problem and further damage our local environment.

I am also concerned about the severe impact these development proposals will have on local services in particular our schools and NHS services.

Rawdon is an attractive area on the urban fringe close to green fields and rural landscapes. We would be appalled at the potential loss of so much valued green space to yet more housing developments on top of those that have already occurred in recent years. We would ask the planning officers and our elected representatives to consider long and hard before they recommend acceptance of these excessive development proposals and their detrimental effect on our green spaces, local services and transport networks.

I would ask you all to better consider the development opportunities of brown field sites throughout Leeds and to tackle the number of empty homes across the city as sustainable development alternatives.

I look forward to hearing the Council's position and that of our elected representatives in response to our concerns. I am also troubled (as are many I have spoken to) by the apparent lack of consultation with so many residents who will be affected by these proposals.

Yours sincerely,  
John Davies

---

**Name: Steve Graham**

**Representor No: PRS06086**

Representation ID: REP06939      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

To whom it may concern,

I write to express both, my wife and my, overall concern at the whole question of housing strategy.

Is it necessary to find such a raft of new sites, when we have so many un-occupied current houses/sites. Surely re-grading and re-furbishing existing sites/buildings, where the infrastructure is already in place. would be both cheaper and far less destructive and controversial. It seems to me that the current approach is to just identify new sites with out a great deal of thought to re-generation and re-energising of existing locations. Of course we all delight in our rural settings and green surroundings and why shouldn't we ? Come to think of it why don't the Council seek to energetically preserve and promote our wonderful City's green environment?

Come on, you have to be more imaginative than this. It feels like the Council are simply taking the easiest, yet most controversial options to score political point against the Government.

On the outrageous proposals to increase the size of my village by 30% all my comments above apply, but I would comment specifically:

- unacceptable and unnecessary loss of green belt
- increased commuting on the already busy corridor through Headingley, as there is no prospect of local employment.
- impact on the oversubscribed local schools and the subsequent potential additional strain on already limited road space.
- lack of current local facilities in what, is a small village.
- Sites on Breary Lane East (ref 1080 & 3367A) are in reality straight forward urban sprawl.
- Limited public transport, especially in the evening and at weekends, with little prospect of any increase, would lead to difficulties and potential social issues in the village.
- the damage to the local environment both during and after the housing construction.
- Bramhope is a pretty village, dating back hundreds of years, and it should be preserved rather than drastically changed.

Please carefully consider our thoughts along with all the many more, in similar vein, i am sure you will receive

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Amy De-balsi

**Representor No:** PRS06087

Representation ID: REP06959      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

We strongly oppose Leeds City Council's strategy to use Green Belt land for housing development. The arbitrary allocation of housing numbers by area when there are many suitable brownfield sites across Leeds is irresponsible. We, like Greg Mullholland, feel strongly that further brownfield sites should be prioritised, built with the right amenities and infrastructure for sustainable communities.

---

**Name:** Mike Willison

**Representor No:** PRS06090

Representation ID: REP07537      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I write on behalf of Leeds Local Access Forum (LLAF) regarding the Consultation on the Site Allocations – Issues and Options. Please note that the following represents the opinion of the Leeds Local Access Forum.

The LAF strongly urges that the following policy be included in the Site Allocations DPD.

Any plans for the development of sites allocated in this Site Allocations DPD should clearly identify not only existing public rights of way (PROW), but should have due regard to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) by also identifying aspirational routes, and securing funding where possible.

Such a policy will ensure that existing PROW and aspirational routes set out in the ROWIP are always taken into account whenever proposals for development are being considered.

---

**Name:** Martyn Carnell

**Representor No:** PRS06091

Representation ID: REP06951      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

In response to your consultation documents I would make the following points:

Access to all the proposed development sites is via the High Street, Boston Spa. This is the obvious direct route to the A1 and the one by which residents enter and exit the village.

The High Street at Boston Spa is congested already, a number of local businesses have parking spaces outside their premises and together with the existing residents who have to use roadside parking, The High Street is often effectively reduced to 'one way' traffic. The additional congestion caused by the new residents would be unthinkable.

I note your proposal does not take into consideration the site on Grove Road which has already received planning approval and will bring approximately 200 more vehicles into and out of the village on a daily basis.

There are additional development sites proposed in Clifford and Newton Kyme; the majority of residents in these locations will also use the High Street for access to their villages.

Finally there is a school on The High Street which not only causes parking congestion at the moment but there is the added danger to children crossing the busy road. This one road will not support the number of additional vehicles these proposals will generate.

# General Comments

Name: Jill Nimmo

Representor No: PRS06092

Representation ID: REP06946 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

SITE ALLOCATION IN ADEL- SITE REFS:

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

NAME ... J: ..... N\..... j .. \:J N I N\ff(

ADDRESS.J~ .. ~ .. ~ .. ~

.. ~ ..... h\$.1~ .. ~ .. ~

.2,q

DATE ..... JULY 2013

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

## 1. GREEN BELT

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

NPPF paras 87-89 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt •. inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances ... 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

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

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

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

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

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

NPPF Core Planning Principle 5 " ... protecting the Green Belts ... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside", NPPF para 79 " ... the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence ... ", NPPF para 81 " ... local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes ... minimising impacts on biodiversity" and CS Section 2 acknowledgement that " ... Green Belt •. is very important in its own right

# General Comments

Name: Jill Nimmo

Representor No: PRS06092

for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment ... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing. ... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

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

ii

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

A) Green Belt against other green spaces -for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 - Protected Playing Pitch

B) site 1178A against other Green Belt sites - for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site 1178A objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear, defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

## 2. SPATIALSTRATEGYAND POLICY

CS's Spatial Policy 1(ii) " ... identification of land for development with priority given in the following order: (A) previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, (B) other suitable locations within the relevant settlement, (C) key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement" and the definition of "sustainable development" in the CS as having " ... minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains ... "

CS's Spatial Policy 6 "(ii) preference for brownfield and regeneration sites", (iii) the least impact on Green Belt purposes, (iv) opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities ... (vi) the least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation"

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

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

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

- it is not a brownfield or regeneration site
- it will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings
- key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance
- as set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the

iii

congestion impact on the local network - tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site

- destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space
- it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood by virtue of the destruction of a beautiful landscape whose openness and biodiversity is much valued by local residents
- destruction of the landscape will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of local residents

- is in no way a sustainable development that has "minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gain" - it will involve destruction of Green Belt and increased congestion and pollution from the vehicles of new residents and the only economic benefits will be for the landowner(s) and developer(s)

NPPF para 76 and 77 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for protection special green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances ... The designation should only be used: (i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (ii) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty ... tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"

# General Comments

Name: Jill Nimmo

Representor No: PRS06092

I would like to take this opportunity to formally notify LCC that I, and several other residents of Dunstarn Lane and Dunstarn Drive, wish to have sites 1178A and 11788 designated as Local Green Space and wish for this to be considered for when the Leeds Development Framework is either implemented or reviewed.

## 3. TRANSPORT

CS Policy H1: "sites which best address the following criteria \*\*\* locations which have the best public transport accessibility"

CS Policy Statement T2 re Transport "New developments should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways \*\*\* which will not create or materially add to problems of efficiency on the highway network"

NPPF para 38 "... key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties"

Allowing development on 1178A would, without question, constitute a direct contravention of the provisions by LCC. As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor with the site getting 2 out of 5 for Accessibility ("poor public transport access"), 1 out of 5 for Access and 3 out of 5 for the congestion impact on the local network - tellingly, LCC's Highways team has refused to give its support to development on the site!

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

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

## ENVIRONMENT AND BIODIVERSITY

iv

CS's Section 1 objective of "maintaining and protecting and enhancing environmental quality for the people of Leeds" and NPPF para 30 "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion"

CS's Section 2 acknowledgement that "... Green Belt... is very important in its own right for aspects such as biodiversity and urban cooling. The quality of the environment... is important to improve physical and mental health as it provides a sense of wellbeing ... the district's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched"

CS's Spatial Vision's Objective 21: "protect and enhance green infrastructure, strategic green corridors, green space, and areas of important landscape character ..." and CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that "... Green Infrastructure ... is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. A key function of Green Infrastructure is to help maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of local communities and the wider setting of places"

NPPF para 123 "planning policies and decisions should aim to ... identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their amenity value for this reason"

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

- destruction of a Green Belt site does not in any way constitute the respect, conservation or enrichment of landscape character or green infrastructure
- destruction of such green infrastructure does not in any way maintain, protect or enhance the environmental quality, benefit physical and mental health or have a positive effect on quality of life of the community
- only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household. The combination of an increased number of cars and poor public transport access will lead to a significant negative trend in respect of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions

CS Policy P12 Landscape "The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes ... will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness ...", CS's natural habitat and biodiversity aim to "protect and enhance the natural environment of the district", NPPF para 109 "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes ... minimising impacts on biodiversity", CS Policy G8 Biodiversity Improvements "Development will be required to demonstrate ... that there will be an overall net gain for biodiversity and NPPF para 118 "local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity ... if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided ... then planning permission should be refused"

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

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

In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, site 1178A should be redesignated as a "RED" site not suitable for development.

v

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

- 11788 - DUNSTARN LANE
- 1079, 1243 and 1246 - LONG CAUSEWAY

# General Comments

---

**Name: Jill Nimmo**

**Representor No: PRS06092**

• 2052 - TILE LANE

As regards the following sites:

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

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

• 12998 - 80DINGTON HALL: reclassify as "AMBER" or "GREEN" as preservation of Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations nor be of paramount concern for this site which adjoins Weetwood Police Station given that there is plenty of the same at the retained site to the east of it (facing Ring Road), on the opposite of Otley Road (next to Crematorium), Bedquills, Lawnswood School and the sites off each of Weetwood Lane and Weetwood Avenue. Access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services. More importantly, sites such as this should be considered as more suitable for housebuilding than Green Belt protected sites.

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

I would be grateful if LCC would take these representations into account when progressing the Site Allocations Plan and would welcome the opportunity to meet, together with my fellow Adel residents, a representative of LCC to discuss our concerns further.

---

**Name: Lesley Hoff**

**Representor No: PRS06093**

Representation ID: REP06949      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

The Parish Council supports the decision to sieve out the sites:

1056  
1088  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1315  
1316  
3019  
3020  
3323

Members wish to register strong concerns over the following sites:

797 [lime green]

2061 [can't work out site reference]

277 [can't work out site reference]

295 [can't work out site reference]

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Joan Usher

**Representor No:** PRS06094

Representation ID: REP06956      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am contacting you to voice my objection to the proposed plans to build over 600 houses on the green fields adjacent to Apperley Lane, Warm Lane and the A65 which have been shown on the Site Allocation map for Aireborough.

My objections are twofold. Firstly that the semi-rural pocket of land on Apperley Lane/Warm Lane provides a much needed open space in an already overcrowded area. The local farm shop and animal enclosures attracts people from the surrounding area and is a valuable amenity. You really cannot build on every green space you come across. Such building has a detrimental effect on the neighbourhood and community and there are plenty of brown field sites I am sure that should be used in priority.

Secondly the roads in this area can hardly cope with the current level of traffic, never mind the increase that such a building plan will bring. Apperley Lane from the JCT600 roundabout to the Micklefield Lane junction was never designed to take the volume of traffic or size of vehicle that now rattle their way along the road at high speed. The A65 is already notorious across the city of Leeds for being overwhelmed with the traffic it has to carry and the constant stream of traffic along the A658 means you can sometimes be stuck for 20 minutes or more just trying to join the queues from the side streets. I don't know how you can contemplate putting any more traffic into this area.

My final concern with the proposals is that without one of my neighbours catching me in the garden at the weekend and handing me a leaflet on the subject I would not even have known that any proposals were in the offing. How can the planning department be so underhand with local residents? Everyone household in the area and certainly those adjacent to these sites should have received a communication from Leeds City Council. These are my initial objections and I would have liked to have given more time to thinking about and expounding them but I understand today is the last day for making representations. I hope you will think again on these plans and communicate more fully with the local people affected the next time around.

---

**Name:** Diane Barnes

**Representor No:** PRS06095

Representation ID: REP06953      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I live close to the Headingley/Meanwood border and use the facility of Meanwood Park. I also use the path through the allotments and other green corridors in the area. When I walk these routes my spirits are uplifted and I feel everlastingly grateful to the Victorian Councillors and benefactors who had the foresight to realise what a valuable contribution these green spaces are for local communities. It seems our modern council is set on changing things, to the detriment of local residents, in my opinion.

My mother is soon to move into Meanwood, in Cross Bentley Lane. We have received no notification of the Leeds Site Development plan, no letters, nothing. Why not? Surely there should be public consultations? Are the proposals available at local libraries? I'm disgruntled!



# General Comments

---

**Name: Graham Latty**

**Representor No: PRS06099**

Representation ID: REP07099      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

In formulating our response to the consultation on the future development of Guiseley & Rawdon Ward we have gradually and over time hardened our original and long held opinion that Aireborough has had enough.

We believe that the principle of Leeds adopting a proper plan of where and when development can take place is basically sound. We are a growing City and want to continue to grow. Growth however must be for the benefit of local populations, not a reason to sacrifice them for the sake of developers who can see only the sites at the end of their collective noses rather than embrace the totality of Leeds. Why can they not rise to the challenge of taking on huge potential development sites of South and South Central Leeds? Sites where it is possible to create a new infrastructure rather than to strain past bursting point an infrastructure already bursting? If not then why did we link the M1 into this area?

The government wants to create a bottom up relationship with localities. It wants people to have some control over how their neighbourhoods develop and where. It wants them to be able to protect local character, to keep and create "places", not surely, to be party to the exact opposite, their destruction.

So, now to Aireborough. Over the last 15/20 years we have seen the gradual destruction of the industrial character of our townships. Factories have been knocked down like ninepins; Parkinson's, Shires, Silver Cross, Peats Mills, Greenwoods, the list goes on; gas and electric sites have gone, so too has our Grammar School, and notably one Hospital (High Royds); Naylor Jennings is going, all for the sake of more and more houses. And more importantly not one jot of improvement to our infrastructure.

Aireborough is defined by one thing, the A65. This road starts in Cumbria and reaches Aireborough via Skipton, Addingham, Burley –in-Wharfedale and then Menston. All these places send their populations to work in Leeds with perhaps a few going into Bradford. Their only route is the A65 and the only changes to that over this period is the addition of pedestrian crossings, traffic lights and a very big island in Guiseley known as the Gyratory. These, do not ease the flow, they slow it. Along this choked road we have built on every available site, and everyone living in these sites has to use the A65 to get anywhere.

All this development has, with the exception of two protected area of search (PAS) Sites, been on Brownfield land. Because of that the effects have been to increase the population without spreading our built boundaries.

What we are now expected to condone is the introduction of a further sixteen hundred (net) houses on Greenfield Sites. Sixteen hundred houses will mean approximately three thousand two hundred people. Those people will drive cars and the only way out of Aireborough is via the A65. To reach that road there will be a strain put onto the, in most cases, very narrow internal roads. Three thousand two hundred people will have quite a lot of children and at present we have local uproar because we do not currently have room in our Primary Schools for the children already here. Nor have we an easy solution to that problem. There is a lack of medical and particularly dental cover now. Parking is a perpetual headache, getting worse by the day. Recently we had two new major stores open in the retail park. This has resulted in vastly increased traffic and at weekends the A65 grinds to a halt.

As if all this is not sufficient, Bradford is likely to build several hundred houses in Derry Hill at Menston. The people living there will be Leeds facing, Bradford means nothing to Menston, so where will they all go? Onto the A65, into our schools, shops, parking spaces and so on.

Over the period of recent development it has been a struggle to get housing that is not just "off the shelf" but bears some relationship to the old townships we live in. Mostly we failed, apart from getting chimneys recognised as a must have. The factories that went were full of character, as was the housing for their workers. That remains, but it is usually at odds with the new build.

As we have said the essential character of Aireborough has been badly damaged but not completely lost. We still have some open space in and around the Townships but the proposals before us leave no area safe. Historic buildings in historic settings could be surrounded by new build, long distance views will disappear. Boundaries will get blurred and local pride will suffer a dreadful blow. Little London Conservation Area could be joined to Nether Yeadon, joined to Westfield Estate. You would probably be able to walk from Horsforth to Menston without seeing a field. Development on the green fields between Netherfield Road and the A65 would be another filling of a buffer gap. And Wills Gill could be another infill which would remove any green fields between Yeadon and Guiseley.

We have had development in spades. We are just about surviving but even without all this prospective building we are struggling. These proposals will change Aireborough forever and not for the benefit of anyone, not even the incomers.

Finally we say Think again, Leeds is a big place, you can find space for 2300 houses (gross) without laying a finger on Aireborough. Please do it.

---

**Name: Andrew Upton**

**Representor No: PRS06101**

Representation ID: REP06963      Question Ref: G1

Greenspace

Having looked at the LDF plan, I have noticed that the allotments on Lydgate Place are not included in the green space allocation, whilst those on Carr Road are.

As you are aware, the allotments on Lydgate Place have been an important asset to the local community for some 100 years. Last year I helped support and set up an allotment association to help improve the facilities at the allotments.

Could you help us make sure that this allotment land is protected. I have included the Leeds Outer West Green space plan for your reference

[Info from Local Plans West: Small irregularly shaped allotment site at the top of Lydgate Lane, Calverley. Using Google maps, the SW plot appears to have been lost to a new build house and its expansive garden but the rest of site appears to remain in allotment use. The site is 0.38 Ha and is not in any previous PPG17 Audit.]

# General Comments

Name: Chris Smith

Representor No: PRS06102

Representation ID: REP06964 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Why not develop on a larger scale in South and East Leeds where it would be welcomed, the wealth could be spread around the city and not be confined to the North and West.  
The infrastructure of roads and access are in place and with some more long term thinking the housing shortage could be resolved now and in the future. A Mini Milton Keynes is the solution not "patch work quilting" for the short term at huge loss for those close by!  
Supplying a quota to central government so Leeds City Council maintain some control over there proud city is a disaster, more mistakes that can't be undone will be made!

Through fear of a developers ability to lobby Central Planning because we don't have a plan, we are now rushing our housing strategy.  
Under pressure things always go wrong!

Representation ID: REP06964 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

\*Through the development of Leeds Bradford Airport, Rawdon residents are now subject to increased pollution and noise. At what point are peoples human rights taken into consideration when they are already carrying the heavy burden of previous and on-going forced development.

Representation ID: REP06964 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

\*The process of notification and consultation with residents most likely to be affected by new housing has been appalling. I have attended numerous meetings through word of mouth that have been so poorly attended generally, I would have to question the engagement and communication from the council at a local level.  
The documentation produced for these consultations is excellent, shame most people won't get to read them!  
What efforts have the authority made to ensure people truly understand what's at stake in there city?

Representation ID: REP06964 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

\*Walkers and local residents use this Greenbelt every day and would consider any suggestion that it was less important than other Greenbelt as ill-informed and plain wrong!  
\*Rawdon is an Historic town, now quite rare within the suburbs of Leeds. Further development will continue to erode the rhythm of Rawdon, until eventually it is no more than a rat run for traffic, polluted with a decreasing quality of life for those who specifically chose to live there before these detrimental changes which are not of their making!  
\*The A65 corridor is already oversubscribed and a traffic management system will not alleviate this problem, only guarantee your waiting time!

\*Rawdon already suffers from the larger developments completed in recent years in the wider Aireborough area, most of that traffic transits towards Leeds and the motorway network passing along the A65 and through Rawdon Village!  
True infrastructure is work and there's not much in Aireborough!

Representation ID: REP06964 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Leeds City Council,  
Having had time to consider the sites LCC deem suitable for housing as part of SHLAA, I strongly object to any development on site 3329.  
PLEASE NOTE THESE COMMENTS ARE NOT BORN OUT OF NIMBYISM - WHICH SEEMS TO BE AN EASY LABEL TO ATTACH TO THOSE WHO WANT TO PRESERVE SOMETHING CLOSE TO THEM!  
I would make the following comments.  
\*Greenbelt policy should be adhered to in all cases. Greenbelt was designed to prevent this very situation.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Helen & Marek Setnicka-zambas**

**Representor No: PRS06105**

Representation ID: REP06969      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We know this area well and feel its sad that it is not more accessible to residents in the area. As you can see from the map there are very few green area for residents to have as play areas for children and dog walking.  
We both feel the area would be a great public access area however 89 residential dwellings is too many and results in crammed houses, stacked flats, no green gardens as housing developers are greedy and want to stack people in like animals to maximise profit.

As a planning department you have a public duty to stop this over greediness and state what you want for your residents and say no to these unethical schemes.

We think housing for a max of 40 dwellings with really eco friendly green spaces with minimum of 2 large innovative play spaces with equipment to suit up to 14 year olds must be part of an integrated plan.

The newly built estate on Owlcoates road is horrific...stacked blocks with no green space. crammed with cars...its poor planning.

Fewer well planned housing areas with space to walk, green space to collect rain and stop adding to local flood issues and really good quality play areas with thought for local residents who walk dogs..so provision of poop bins is a must  
89 dwellings with potentially 1-2 cars per households is too many cars to add to the local traffic burden. With 40 dwellings we suggest road access to Dick lane, Daleside road and Leeds Bradford road to enable dispersal of traffic at peak times  
So can we see the public exhibition up again...one day is pathetic  
Can we have more information about the 89 dwellings and what that description is of houses flats etc.

We would say NO to 89 dwellings but would consider a yes for 40 Dwellings with an integrated eco friendly design of 2 play areas, green gardens and parkland area with dog walking facilities.

The area is currently used by a gentleman who keeps his horses there...again a plan to keeping a grazing area where horses could be kept. We have a population of travellers who use the ground and horses if well kept can add to the areas appeal and keep better welfare control on these animals that seem very well cared for..

We are both happy to play a part in being a local voice.

Please can we see the plans again and have more information

---

**Name: AR Briggs & Co**

**Representor No: PRS06106**

Representation ID: REP06977      Question Ref: G2

Greenspace

We broadly support in principle the proposal however there should be a realistic prospect that the greenspace can be used for the intended purpose, i.e. the land is in public ownership or there is a willing landowner.

Representation ID: REP06977      Question Ref: G3

Greenspace

We strongly support the release of surplus greenspace for development. The greenspaces are often located within highly sustainable locations and the release of surplus sites could make a valuable contribution towards meeting the shortfall of housing sites within the district. Equally, it is evident that the main issue is the quality rather than quantity of the Green Spaces within North Sub Area and the wider district. Therefore it would appear to be a sensible measure to concentrate limited resources on those types of greenspaces where there is an identified shortfall.

Representation ID: REP06977      Question Ref: G4

Greenspace

We agree that resources should be channelled to improving the quality of existing sites

Representation ID: REP06977      Question Ref: G5

Greenspace

We strong support the principle of releasing poor quality and/or disused sites for development.

Representation ID: REP06977      Question Ref: G6

Greenspace

We agree that ideally new greenspace provision should be provided in areas where existing provision falls below the required accessibility distance standards. However if it is the Council's intention to fund the additional provision through developer contributions or CIL, it is essential that careful consideration is given to the impact that this would have on the financial viability of development schemes.

# General Comments

Name: Elizabeth Crosland

Representor No: PRS06109

Representation ID: REP06980

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

It should not be necessary to build on "green field" and "Green Belt" sites in Leeds when one considers the number of "brown field" sites already allocated for development. The reason building companies and their associates do not wish to utilise these areas is due to higher cost — therefore less profit — i.e. greed. If these companies are allowed by the "powers that be" to pursue this policy the whole country will be left with numerous areas of derelict land within towns and cities and large sprawling urban areas of box like dwellings covering what was previously pleasant countryside and "Green Belt" land (which when designated was deemed to be sacred). The end result will be disastrous for the environment. People will live further away from their place of work, again bad for the environment and also human health. Whole areas will lose their sense of identity and many of these dwellings will be the slums of the future. It is only necessary to look back to the 1960's to see the truth of this statement. The use of "brown field" sites could also mean that smaller numbers of people would be more easily integrated into existing communities. Existing services, medical and dental practices and schools would be more able to assimilate smaller numbers.

Garforth cannot cope with 4500 new homes. Services are already stretched to breaking point, parts of Garforth are already prone to flooding and the sewage system could not cope. 4500 new homes will equate to approximately 7000 extra vehicles (some homes will have more than one car) and 4500 children (some will have no children and some more than one child). These figures could well be a conservative estimate. Garforth Town End already has traffic problems at rush hour as does the Selby Road. All the extra vehicles would result in gridlock. Medical and dental services would be totally inadequate and new schools would have to be built.

Large areas marked on the Site Allocation Map as "having potential" are in fact part of the proposed route for HS2 so would appear to have no potential.

A Traveller Site should not be part of any plan as it would not bring anything positive to Garforth which has deteriorated dramatically in the last 25 years from an attractive semi-rural village to an increasingly unattractive urban environment.

Garforth does not need another supermarket. Main Street is already struggling with the number of empty shops.

Garforth does need more leisure facilities. The population has greatly increased but there is a distinct lack of "things to do and places to go". Selby has a cinema based, I believe, in a community centre with daytime and evening shows — some free. A pool based on the Dome at Doncaster would draw visitors to Garforth and hopefully also bring new life to Main Street. Teenagers need somewhere they can meet up with friends, play pool, bring their own music or just gossip so there wouldn't be a need for them to gather on street corners bored and possibly causing trouble. This is what makes a community and these things have to be factored in alongside housing. There has to be a balance.

To summarise my view is that no "green field" or "Green Belt" land should be built on whilst "brown field" sites are available. This is basic commonsense. We are all encouraged to recycle and there is no good reason why this should not happen when it comes to building any facility be it housing, leisure or industrial.

If however common sense does not prevail — and from past experience I doubt it will — my suggestion regarding Garforth is that a completely new self-sufficient community be established at Peckfield. This would be an ideal opportunity to build zero carbon housing. The builders should also have to pay a premium for being allowed to build on a "green field" site in the form of providing a primary school and community centre.

Also as a final word the publicity given to the Consultation Event in Garforth was abysmal — no-one seemed to know anything about it. I regularly use the library and peruse the notice board in Main Street and saw nothing until after the event. 0/10 for effort.

Representation ID: REP07625

Question Ref: H10

Housing

If however commonsense does not prevail — and from past experience I doubt it will — my suggestion regarding Garforth is that a completely new self sufficient community be established at Peckfield. This would be an ideal opportunity to build zero carbon housing. The builders should also have to pay a premium for being allowed to build on a "green field" site in the form of providing a primary school and community centre.

Representation ID: REP07625

Question Ref: H12

Housing

A Traveller Site should not be part of any plan as it would not bring anything positive to Garforth which has deteriorated dramatically in the last 25 years from an attractive semi-rural village to an increasingly unattractive urban environment.

Representation ID: REP07625

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Garforth

It should not be necessary to build on "green field" and "Green Belt" sites in Leeds when one considers the number of "brown field" sites already allocated for development. The reason building companies and their associates do not wish to utilise these areas is due to higher cost — therefore less profit — i.e. greed. If these companies are allowed by the "powers that be" to pursue this policy the whole country will be left with numerous areas of derelict land within towns and cities and large sprawling urban areas of box like dwellings covering what was previously pleasant countryside and "Green Belt" land (which when designated was deemed to be sacred). The end result will be disastrous for the environment. People will live further away from their place of work, again bad for the environment and also human health. Whole areas will lose their sense of identity and many of these dwellings will be the slums of the future. It is only necessary to look back to the 1960's to see the truth of this statement. The use of "brown field" sites could also mean that smaller numbers of people would be more easily integrated into existing communities. Existing services, medical and dental practices and schools would be more able to assimilate smaller numbers.

Garforth cannot cope with 4500 new homes. Services are already stretched to breaking point, parts of Garforth are already prone to flooding and the sewage system could not cope. 4500 new homes will equate to approximately 7000 extra vehicles (some homes will have more than one car) and 4500 children (some will have no children and some more than one child). These figures could well be a conservative estimate. Garforth Town End already has traffic problems at rush hour as does the Selby Road. All the extra vehicles would result in gridlock. Medical and dental services would be totally inadequate and new schools would have to be built.

Large areas marked on the Site Allocation Map as "having potential" are in fact part of the proposed route for HS2 so would appear to have no potential.

Garforth does need more leisure facilities. The population has greatly increased but there is a distinct lack of "things to do and places to go". Selby has a cinema based, I believe, in a community centre with daytime and evening shows — some free. A pool based on the Dome at Doncaster would draw visitors to Garforth and hopefully also bring new life to Main Street. Teenagers need somewhere they can meet up with friends, play pool, bring their own music or just gossip so there wouldn't be a need for them to gather on street corners bored and possibly causing trouble. This is what makes a community and these things have to be factored in alongside housing. There has to be a balance.

To summarise my view is that no "green field" or "Green Belt" land should be built on whilst "brown field" sites are available. This is basic commonsense. We are all encouraged to recycle and there is no good reason why this should not happen when it comes to building any facility be it housing, leisure or industrial.

Also as a final word the publicity given to the Consultation Event in Garforth was abysmal — no-one seemed to know anything about it. I regularly use the library and peruse the notice board in Main Street and saw nothing until after the event. 0/10 for effort.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Elizabeth Crosland**

**Representor No: PRS06109**

Representation ID: REP07639      Question Ref: R3

Retail

Garforth does not need another supermarket. Main Street is already struggling with the number of empty shops.

Representation ID: REP07639      Question Ref: R3

Retail

Garforth does not need another supermarket. Main Street is already struggling with the number of empty shops.

---

**Name: G Shaw**

**Representor No: PRS06114**

Representation ID: REP06981      Question Ref: G1

Greenspace

No comment

Representation ID: REP06981      Question Ref: G2

Greenspace

Yes, greenspace could be more appropriately allocated provided this is not detrimental to the residents in the immediate local area of the re-allocated land.

Representation ID: REP06981      Question Ref: G3

Greenspace

There are no surplus greenspace sites within Boston Spa but this may be appropriate where such conditions exist.  
(Refer to table on PDF for nalysis of Greenspaces in Boston Spa)

Representation ID: REP06981      Question Ref: G4

Greenspace

Commuted sums should be channelled to improve the quality of existing sites, but it may be more important to provide greenspace itself where there is a deficiency (eg a small children's playground may be more important than none at all)  
(Refer to table on PDF for nalysis of Greenspaces in Boston Spa)

Representation ID: REP06981      Question Ref: G5

Greenspace

Development of poor quality greenspace might be allowed. However, replacement greenspace needs to be located where it corrects a deficiency so that residents do not have to travel further than the accessibility limits as laid down in Core Strategy Policy G3  
(Refer to table on PDF for nalysis of Greenspaces in Boston Spa)

Representation ID: REP06981      Question Ref: G6

Greenspace

Most certainly new greenspace provision should be provided in areas that fall below accessibility distance standards despite the difficulty that the ONE area poses in being comprised of scattered populations. The average figures shown in table 6.5.1 mask bigger discrepancies in certain parts of the two wards Harewood and Wetherby such as Boston Spa.  
(Refer to table on PDF for nalysis of Greenspaces in Boston Spa)

Representation ID: REP06981      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

A detailed analysis of Boston Spa Parish greenspace has been carried out, and shows deficits in most types. The table of findings is attached. It can be seen that all types are in deficit except amenity spaces. It should be noted that all the very small sites (less than 0.2 ha) have been included in our analysis and most of these function to improve the appearance of estates. Most have signs preventing ball games etc due to pressure from nearby residents. There is no real amenity space in Boston Spa where people can 'sunbathe, sit and chat, socialise etc.' Nor are there any 'parks and gardens' (Deepdale is a children's playground). There is also a shortage of 'civic space' for socialising, meetings, markets etc.

The village is a ribbon development and the boundary on the north is the river; the south is the green belt between Boston Spa and Clifford parishes. It is, therefore, difficult to locate land that could be suitable for the extra provision of greenspace to bring the area up to the standards laid down in the Core Strategy. Providing land from developments would have to be on a huge scale (much larger than the 80 sq. m. per unit indicated in the Core Strategy) to prevent the village slipping into further deficit as its population and hence its need for greenspace is increased.  
(Refer to table on PDF for nalysis of Greenspaces in Boston Spa)

Representation ID: REP06981      Question Ref: G10

Greenspace

The Core Strategy Policy G3 sets standards for quantity of greenspace per 1000 people. Very small populations are therefore automatically excluded. However, should opportunities arise for provision of new greenspaces, priority should be given to areas with greatest deficit.  
(Refer to table on PDF for nalysis of Greenspaces in Boston Spa)

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Jerry Pearlman

**Representor No:** PRS06121

Representation ID: REP06994

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

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

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

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

# General Comments

**Name: Gillian Swan**

**Representor No: PRS06122**

Representation ID: REP06978      Question Ref: G8

Greenspace

As a participating and community minded resident of the centre of Garforth I have concerns and object to the Strategic Housing Land Allocation proposals on the following grounds:

## TRAFFIC

- 1.increased traffic flow limits egress from Main St on to the main routes at The George, Town end, Selby Rd, Wakefield Rd at Barley hill Rd
- 2.dangerous access onto the main routes from the new developments causing further congestion – as already experienced by residents of The Cliff
- 3.traffic safety for children at all of Garforth's schools
- 4.reduced response times of emergency vehicles as Fire Police and Ambulance combat traffic congestion on roads designed for a more rural flow rate
- 5.traffic flow and safety on Garforth's two narrow railway bridges

## FACILITIES

- 6.limited capacity in Garforth primary schools and academy
- 7.increase in pollution if each of those intended dwellings has even just one vehicle each.
- 8.reduced access to local services for example NHS and Primary Care arising from population explosion; there is already alarm about recruitment in Primary Care and a national shortage of GPs
- 9.congested library and service point access during a period of financial constraint for Leeds council
- 10.will we get our police presence reinstated as the population expands and if not how is our current security maintained and how will the area be policed?

## CONFIDENCE

- 11.recent investment on roads ie Main street to increase lines of vision and a six inch move of pavement kerbing has done little to alleviate parking and has not improved safety as promised, so how can we as residents have confidence that this planning consultation and our contribution will make any difference whatsoever?
- 12.there is uncertainty and calls for extended consultation on the route of the proposed high speed train – so would all investment of time effort and money in consultation and planning for Garforth become valueless over the next couple of years?

## HOMES AND BUSINESSES

- 13.loss of reputation for Garforth as a thriving retail centre as businesses close when retail outlets shift from the centre to the new residential areas
- 14.as reputation and visual amenity for example the current green landscape are lost so occupancy and investment in existing housing, retail and services is influenced
- 15.disruption to travel and Garforth life as workers, their own vehicles and heavy plant move into the area

## PUBLIC TRANSPORT

- 16.uncertainty about investment in local public transport whose customer base would expand considerably; trains between 7:30 – 9:30 often have standing room only and timings are unreliable after 8am.
- 17.the proposed charge of £50 to park vehicles outside our own houses is another stealth tax and doesn't encourage people to leave their cars at home and use public transport
- 18.revision of existing bus routes adding to further congestion on narrow roads for example Barleyhill Rd

## AMENITY

- 19.this is an unjustified incursion into the green spaces which give the villages their identity
- 20.the current green spaces act as a buffer to motorway noise and pollution and may deter the new customer base
- 21.the buildings are scheduled for some of the best arable land for miles around
- 22.by virtue of its scale the development would have an unacceptable impact on the open character of the area
- 23.social and civic cultures/structures which attract incomers will be overwhelmed; the investment, at the proposed scale of greater than 3000 homes, gives little time for new residents to assimilate to the existing infrastructure before that currently robust community succumbs to the needs of other incomers

This has the feel of an urban development and business investment for an ill-defined customer base to benefit greedy investors, the Council will also benefit if each of these houses is also charged £50 to park outside their homes; and if they are not then it will give those of us who face this charge reasonable grounds for appeal.

On this basis and considering items listed above I object strongly.

# General Comments

**Name: Gillian Swan**

**Representor No: PRS06122**

Representation ID: REP06978      Question Ref: G11

Greenspace

As a participating and community minded resident of the centre of Garforth I have concerns and object to the Strategic Housing Land Allocation proposals on the following grounds:

## TRAFFIC

- 1.increased traffic flow limits egress from Main St on to the main routes at The George, Town end, Selby Rd, Wakefield Rd at Barley hill Rd
- 2.dangerous access onto the main routes from the new developments causing further congestion – as already experienced by residents of The Cliff
- 3.traffic safety for children at all of Garforth's schools
- 4.reduced response times of emergency vehicles as Fire Police and Ambulance combat traffic congestion on roads designed for a more rural flow rate
- 5.traffic flow and safety on Garforth's two narrow railway bridges

## FACILITIES

- 6.limited capacity in Garforth primary schools and academy
- 7.increase in pollution if each of those intended dwellings has even just one vehicle each.
- 8.reduced access to local services for example NHS and Primary Care arising from population explosion; there is already alarm about recruitment in Primary Care and a national shortage of GPs
- 9.congested library and service point access during a period of financial constraint for Leeds council
- 10.will we get our police presence reinstated as the population expands and if not how is our current security maintained and how will the area be policed?

## CONFIDENCE

- 11.recent investment on roads ie Main street to increase lines of vision and a six inch move of pavement kerbing has done little to alleviate parking and has not improved safety as promised, so how can we as residents have confidence that this planning consultation and our contribution will make any difference whatsoever?
- 12.there is uncertainty and calls for extended consultation on the route of the proposed high speed train – so would all investment of time effort and money in consultation and planning for Garforth become valueless over the next couple of years?

## HOMES AND BUSINESSES

- 13.loss of reputation for Garforth as a thriving retail centre as businesses close when retail outlets shift from the centre to the new residential areas
- 14.as reputation and visual amenity for example the current green landscape are lost so occupancy and investment in existing housing, retail and services is influenced
- 15.disruption to travel and Garforth life as workers, their own vehicles and heavy plant move into the area

## PUBLIC TRANSPORT

- 16.uncertainty about investment in local public transport whose customer base would expand considerably; trains between 7:30 – 9:30 often have standing room only and timings are unreliable after 8am.
- 17.the proposed charge of £50 to park vehicles outside our own houses is another stealth tax and doesn't encourage people to leave their cars at home and use public transport
- 18.revision of existing bus routes adding to further congestion on narrow roads for example Barleyhill Rd

## AMENITY

- 19.this is an unjustified incursion into the green spaces which give the villages their identity
- 20.the current green spaces act as a buffer to motorway noise and pollution and may deter the new customer base
- 21.the buildings are scheduled for some of the best arable land for miles around
- 22.by virtue of its scale the development would have an unacceptable impact on the open character of the area
- 23.social and civic cultures/structures which attract incomers will be overwhelmed; the investment, at the proposed scale of greater than 3000 homes, gives little time for new residents to assimilate to the existing infrastructure before that currently robust community succumbs to the needs of other incomers

This has the feel of an urban development and business investment for an ill-defined customer base to benefit greedy investors, the Council will also benefit if each of these houses is also charged £50 to park outside their homes; and if they are not then it will give those of us who face this charge reasonable grounds for appeal.

On this basis and considering items listed above I object strongly.



## General Comments

---

**Name: Kcs Developments Limited KCS Developments Limited**

**Representor No: PRS06124**

Representation ID: REP07006      Question Ref: G2

Greenspace

We broadly support in principle the proposal however there should be a realistic prospect that the greenspace can be used for the intended purpose, i.e. the land is in public ownership or there is a willing landowner.

Representation ID: REP07006      Question Ref: G3

Greenspace

We strongly support the release of surplus greenspace for development. The greenspaces are often located within highly sustainable locations and the release of surplus sites could make a valuable contribution towards meeting the shortfall in housing sites within the district. Equally, it is evident that the main issue is the quality rather than quantity of the Green Spaces within Morley and the wider district. Therefore, it would appear to be a sensible measure to concentrate limited resources on those types of greenspaces where there is an identified shortfall.

Representation ID: REP07006      Question Ref: G4

Greenspace

We agree that resources should be channelled to improving the quality of existing sites

Representation ID: REP07006      Question Ref: G5

Greenspace

We strong support the principle of releasing poor quality and/or disused sites for development.

Representation ID: REP07006      Question Ref: G6

Greenspace

We agree that ideally new greenspace provision should be provided in areas where existing provision falls below the required accessibility distance standards. However if it is the Council's intention to fund the additional provision through developer contributions or CIL, it is essential that careful consideration is given to the impact this would have on the financial viability of development schemes.

---

**Name: Rita Grayson**

**Representor No: PRS06131**

Representation ID: REP07005      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Dear Sir/Madam

I am a resident of the local area to which the council plan to build 234 houses on green belt land. Myself and other residents within this area feel strongly about the local community, therefore to build 234 houses right on our doorstep is has a cause of concern.

Sheltered accommodation is directly opposite where you wish to build, meaning upset and discomfort would be brought upon the elderly. It is almost a certainty that when building these houses it will bring the residents within the sheltered accommodation to become restless and unsettled in their own home. If the houses were to be built, there is a strong possibility that the new residents could cause disruption to the local community as it stands today. I strongly encourage you to reconsider your plans on location and allow Lofthouse to stay been belt.

I look forward to your response and update of the current situation.

Many thanks

Mrs Rita Grayson

# General Comments

---

**Name: Guy Davis**

**Representor No: PRS06139**

Representation ID: REP07016      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am a resident of Collingham of over twenty years and will be directly impacted by the proposed developments. I attended the latest consultation event in the village, having attended the first some months ago. Both were well informed and helpful. It is clear that Leeds has to create more homes, but the proposed developments in Collingham seem sub optimal compared to the Thorp Arch and Headley Hall developments that present the strategic opportunity to develop vibrant sustainable new communities rather than creating pressure on amenities and infrastructure in an existing community such as Collingham. The concerns with any development of over 20 houses in Collingham include;

- congestion in the village centre and particularly where the A58 and A659 meet at the Half Moon.
- The A639 is a major commuter and commercial thoroughfare already prone to congestion at peak times, this will only get worse if many homeowners are added to the access onto the A 639
- the A639 has a history of accidents, some fatal.
- planning for recent developments Bluecoats and Wits End were limited in number of houses due to concerns with access to the A639, and dangerous sight lines at the top of the hill. The proposed high density development seems to overlook these previous planning concerns.
- residents of Harewood Road and Upper Langwith at the top of the hill regularly suffer sewage problems with the main sewer backing up and Yorkshire Water having to do emergency call outs. Extra housing in the area will increase the pressure on the already inadequate sewage system.
- Parking at local shops and amenities will become even more pressured than it is already.
- the local primary school is a key feature and attraction to living in the village, but is already unable to support anything like all the children in the catchment area. This position would be severely impacted for the worse if there is any significant development in the village.

For all these reasons I strongly support development in Thorp Arch and Headley Hall over any of the proposed developments in Collingham. If any of the developments proposed for Collingham are to proceed the amenity and infrastructure points above, and many others, must be addressed first to ensure the fabric of the village can withstand any influx of more people.

---

**Name: S Palmer**

**Representor No: PRS06144**

Representation ID: REP07029      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP07029      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a seperate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Heavisides Tim & Gail**

**Representor No: PRS06145**

Representation ID: REP07021      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

It has come to our attention that LCC plans to allow 2,300 new houses to be built in the aireborough area over the next 15 years. We object most strongly and vigorously to the notion that green belt areas can be used for this purpose, particularly considering the number of vacant properties already in the leeds area and the likelihood that brown field sites have not been thoroughly investigated and considered.

We live on Apperley Lane close to Warm Lane, (The Old Rawdon Manse, grade II listed) and it is evident to us that the infrastructure in this locality will not support a large development (we understand nearly 750 houses in and around JCT roundabout, including areas on Warm Lane, Gill Lane and Green Lane), nor will the present facilities such, as schools, doctors, etc cope with such development.

The proposed housing shown as area 3033 will cause urban sprawl and clearly blurr and merge Leeds with Bradford.

We will take all measures available to us to object to this planning proposal. We believe losing these green field areas would damage Yeadon and Rawdon and areas known as Nether Yeadon and Little London would change character and be lost forever. We need hlep to protect this heritage and preserve our already struggling villages.

Thank you for taking the time to read our objections.

# General Comments

---

**Name: S Burrett**

**Representor No: PRS06156**

Representation ID: REP07041      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP07041      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

---

**Name: Jean Rowley**

**Representor No: PRS06158**

Representation ID: REP07043      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP07043      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

---

**Name: Trinity College, Cambridge**

**Representor No: PRS06161**

Representation ID: REP07050      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Nowell Approach off Nowell Lane LS9 GJD -[see plan submitted]

This site was submitted by Bidwells on behalf of Trinity College in response to the call for sites in 2012. However, the site has not been identified on the Council's maps and has not been assessed. Therefore, the original submission is attached. The site is currently a complex of poor quality commercial units and it is proposed for residential development. It is located adjacent to residential development to the east and west and the wider area is within a Neighbourhood Renewal Area. Therefore, Trinity College considers that the site should be allocated for residential use and Trinity College request that the Council makes the necessary changes to the Local Plan .

Representation ID: REP07053      Question Ref: R4

Retail

Site at Domestic Street, Sydenham Street and Holbeck Lane - [plan attached to original submission]

Trinity College propose the site at Domestic Street, Sydenham Street and Holbeck Lane as a suitable location for alternative uses such as trade counter, retail or showroom as the site is adjacent to similar uses. Trinity College request that the Council makes the necessary changes to the Local Plan.

Representation ID: REP07053      Question Ref: R4

Retail

Site at Kirkstall Road Bath and Burley Place - [plan attached to original submission]

The site at Kirkstall Road Bath and Burley Place is currently in use as a car repair garage. Trinity College propose the as a suitable location for alternative uses such as trade counter, retail or showroom. Trinity College request that the Council makes the necessary changes to the Local Plan.

# General Comments

Name: Bernard Mitchinson

Representor No: PRS06165

Representation ID: REP07057 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Site Allocation in Pool In Wharfedale

I do not consider that the sites and developments proposed for this village are unacceptable because of the following general reasons:

- Traffic and access, Pool is already congested and faces the prospect of increased traffic to Leeds Airport, development in the Wharfe Valley, and continuing access to and from the A1. Adding more homes and vehicles will exacerbate a serious problem
- A high-pressure gas pipeline passes through the sites with the associated safety issues.
- Surface water flooding on the sites proposed is a serious problem. Currently, the land and highways suffer because of flooding.
- Pool Primary School is full and cannot guarantee access for local children.
- Routes to the school would conflict with serious traffic problems.
- There is an absence of local employment and most travel by road to work. It is considered that bus services will continue to be reduced.
- The village has no local doctors surgery, and whilst retail services are minimal there is little scope for improvement in facilities parking.
- Access to public transport for evenings and weekends is poor.
- Development would cause an irreversible loss of productive agricultural land.
- With development, there would be a loss of biodiversity, wild life and native vegetation.
- There would be an adverse affect on the Pool Conservation Area.
- There would be loss of an essential green corridor, important landscape views to The Chevin, and tourist attractions.
- Sustainability is important, Pool in Wharfedale is one of the last places one would seek to locate a large scale development; or increase the population by 50%. Pool is the starting point for urban dwellers who wish to enjoy the countryside, its green surround is a benefit to all who visit the village and retention of all of this space is essential.
- The Conservation Appraisal of 2009 granted by Leeds City Council states: "The village on the whole is historic enough to require archaeological consideration even on a small scale development. Development which involves below-ground excavation must have regard to the potential for archaeological finds"
- Pool's infrastructure is under stress and flooding frequently overloads the village drainage system. A recent report from a Pool Parish Councillor, following a visit to Arthington Sewage Works, illustrates the current problem. 'I recently had a good look at the Arthington sewage works in the company of Tom Grange, whose farmland lies between the sewage works and the river. As I understand it, the sewage treatment plant was built in the 1960s, to treat the sewage from Pool, Bramhope, Arthington and Castley. At that time, Bramhope and Pool were small villages, whose populations were a fraction of what they are today. The main sewer runs through flat agricultural land, quite close to the river, and the sewage is then augured up to the treatment beds. There are manholes at intervals, some of which are in a state of disrepair, leading to leakage. The treatment works are also in a state of disrepair, with evidence of leakage. At times of high water flow, the system is unable to cope, causing raw sewage to flow over the fields. As these are riverside fields, this raw sewage must, inevitably, end up in the river. From conversations with residents on Arthington Lane, I understand that the sewer from the modern developments around that part of the village already backs up from its junction with the main sewer, causing flooding and bad smells. If the proposed developments were to go ahead, in Pool and/or Bramhope, this already intolerable situation would become even worse.

In addition to my previous my comments,

The LCC housing proposals are contrary to LCC policies and guidelines from their Local Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework:

'NPPF para 87- 89 'the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt.....'

The developments proposed have the potential for unrestricted sprawl, and the sites perform an important role safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

CS's Spatial Development Strategy declaration that 'the delivery of the strategy will entail the use of brownfield and greenfield land and in exceptional circumstances which cannot be met elsewhere], the selective use of Green Belt land.....having minimal detrimental impact on the environment whilst maximising environmental, economic and social gains.....'

The proposals cannot be considered to be 'selective' and can only be detrimental to Pool in Wharfedale.

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

There are no exceptional circumstances that apply to the proposals for the sites in Pool in Wharfedale. Indeed it would be inappropriate to consider extending the boundaries of a village close to an Area Outstanding Natural Beauty.

CS's Spatial Policy 6'[ii] preference for brownfield and regeneration sites', [iii] the least impact on Green Belt purposes, [iv] opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities....[vi] the least negative and positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green infrastructure, green space and nature conservation'

The proposals for Pool in Wharfedale contradict this policy.

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

Applying this policy will eliminate the proposals for Pool in Wharfedale.

These are just a few policies that when applied to this village will exclude an proposals for housing development in Pool in Wharfedale. The NPPF Core Planning Principle 6, CS's Section 2, CS's Spatial Objective 21, NFPP para 123, CS Policy P12 Landscape, NPPF para 76 and 77, CS Policy H1, CS Policy Policy Statement T2 re Transport, NPPF para 38, and NPPF para 30; all add weight to the view that the proposed housing development should not be considered for Pool in Wharfedale.

I trust Leeds City Council accept these comments and withdraw any development for Pool in Wharfedale.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Debra Ranby**

**Representor No: PRS06167**

Representation ID: REP07058      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Sites 3081A and 3081B

When and where has this information been distributed? I only found out from a neighbour. I have not received any information through my door or by post.

Representation ID: REP07058      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

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.

Representation ID: REP07058      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Sites 3081A and 3081B

Where are the prosed sites for these new development? Building should not be allowed on green belt land, this is a rural area.

---

**Name: Alan & Judith Richardson**

**Representor No: PRS06174**

Representation ID: REP07065      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We write to make clear our objection to the proposed excesive construction of 700 PLUS houses in the region of nether yeadon .

We feel that a development on this scale would finally see the areas infastructure implode,schools doctors dentists the road network all ready unable to cope,employment opportunites unbalanced.

The consequences of said development obvious,a three week wait for a doctors appointment extended,local schools unable to provide enough places ,forcing more parents on the roads for the school run,travel to work either in leeds or bradford on roads already unable to cope increasing from approx 1 hour to 1 hour 15 mins the usual trouble spots such as trinity church and horsforth roundabout recieving more airtime on local radio than the current number one record..

Whilst understanding the council has obligations to fupill regarding housing there are many other areas of leeds that have not suffered development on the scale seen in aireborough in recent years the council must also give serious consideration to the many residents of this area and realise and understand the impact these proposals will have on them.

---

**Name: Morley House Trust**

**Representor No: PRS06175**

Representation ID: REP07066      Question Ref: H5

Housing

4013 - see submitted representation for full details

The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:

- The Green Belt assessment confirms that the site would not constitute rounding off; would be isolated development and relates poorly to the settlement. The site therefore clearly achieves the purposes of including land within the green belt and should not therefore be removed;
- The site fails all accessibility standards;
- The site can only come forward in conjunction with site 3315 which in turn can only come forward in conjunction with 1190. They are potential third party ownership issues that could prevent it from coming forward.

Representation ID: REP07066      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

See also submitted representation for full details

Ford House garden has never previously been considered for development as it has not been included in the SHLAA.

4.18 The Council acknowledge that insufficient land is available to allocate sufficient levels of new housing without having to develop in the Green Belt. As such Green Belt land is proposed to be reallocated to enable the requisite number of homes to be proposed. The principle of this is noted and understood, however as a non Green belt site it is considered that Ford House Garden is sequentially preferable to Green Belt sites and should be considered as an allocation unless specific reasons can be provided for not allocating the site.

# General Comments

**Name: David Harrison**

**Representor No: PRS06178**

Representation ID: REP07071      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I wish to take issue with the Leeds City Council Site Allocations Plan – June 2013.

The 2013-TomTom Congestion-Index for Europe report shows that the Leeds Bradford Area is the 8th most congested conurbation in Europe and the most congested in UK, more than London (10th). Also it has also had the highest increase in traffic in the last year. Please find attached the 2013-TomTom Congestion-Index for Europe.

Secondly I suggest that 66,000 homes is a vast over estimation of the number of required for the next 15 years. Based on the population increase between the censuses of 2001 and 2011, five major cities had larger population increase than Leeds yet their estimated requirement for homes is approximately half the Leeds figure.

In the face of these two facts alone, how can it be justified for Leeds to have a larger percentage increase in house than anywhere else in UK?

Thirdly, currently Leeds infrastructure is overloaded. The roads issue I have commented on. The maternity situation is that both Hospitals in Leeds were closed to maternity admissions for about 100 days during last year such that ladies had to travel to Bradford and other health authorities to give birth with resultant postnatal care issues. Most schools are over capacity now.

These issues must be rectified before any more housing can be considered. One Leeds Councillor said that the houses have to be built so the council can get money from the developers to pay for the infrastructure. I suggest that this would be too little, too late also the amount of money this would raise would not cover the cost of the required infrastructure improvements thus making a bad situation worse. According to the National Planning Policy Framework, the infrastructure for housing should be in place before houses are built. This clearly has not been considered.

Fourthly, the allocation of the share of the Leeds housing requirement, allocated to each area of Leeds, seem not to have taken into account the topography of that area; for example, the percentage available land in that area that can be sensibly used for building.

Fifthly, some areas of Leeds did not have any consultation events and were not informed where there were events that they could attend. Some people have yet to be officially informed that there is consultation period in progress.

The consultation events total 81 hours with only a small amount of this time being in the evenings and weekends. This means that the majority of working people did not have the opportunity to attend these events and discuss the issues.

As this document covers planning for the next 15 years the people most affected would be working or at school. Were older school children and college students consulted? I think not.

Lastly, looking at the site allocations in the areas I know, there seem to be no logic to the suitability ratings put on each proposed site. At a consultation meeting with Aireborough Neighbourhood Forum, a representative of Leeds Planning Department stated that they did not take into account the infrastructure for a given site and did not consult with any other department like highways. They claimed that it would have been deemed collusion. I suggest their priorities are not correct. Again no consideration had been given to the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Leeds City Council Site Allocations Plan – June 2013 is so ill considered that I and many others, consider Leeds Planning Department have lost all credibility and it will take a long time to restore.

Based on the above evidence, I suggest that is document should be declared null and void and it should be reworked after FULL consultation with All the people in Leeds. [PLEASE SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT, TOM TOM EUROPEAN CONGESTION INDEX]

# General Comments

**Name: Clugston Developments Limited**

**Representor No: PRS06182**

Representation ID: REP07072      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Representations to the of the Leeds Sites Allocations Plan (DPD) Issues and Options

## 3.2 Green Belt

This representation is submitted on behalf of Clugston Developments Limited ("Clugston") in relation to the Leeds Sites Allocations Development Plan Document ("DPD").

1.2 Clugston Developments Limited has an interest in land at Wakefield Road, Drighlington ("the Site") and land to the South of Adwalton Business Park (adjacent to the site).

1.3 Clugston wish to promote both sites for housing, as a whole, and have obtained written consent from the landowner (please see Appendix 1 ). The Sites are shown edged red on the attached plan (Appendix 2) as part of the Sites and Policies DPD.

1.4 The Site is located immediately east of the built up area of Drighlington

1.5 The site is currently located within the Green Belt in accordance with the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006.

1.6 The combined Site area is circa 7.45 hectares and could therefore provide around 261 dwellings at a proposed density of 35 dwellings per hectare.

## 2. Policy Background

### Green Belt Review

2.1 In order to meet the required levels of housing set out in the Publication Draft Core Strategy February 2012 (see paragraph 2.13 below) there will have to be a review of the Green Belt. Walton & Co have previously made comments to the Core Strategy, stating that a substantial amount of land for housing needs to be identified in order to ensure that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period. A significant review of the Green Belt is therefore required.

3.3 Both Sites should be considered as part of the Green Belt review and are located in a very sustainable location. This area of land serves no purpose as Green Belt. The land does not stop the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas; it does not prevent neighbouring towns from merging; development of the Site would not lead to encroachment of the countryside; it does not preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and release of this Site would assist with urban regeneration being a sustainable extension to the existing settlement of Drighlington.

3.4 We do not accept the comments as detailed in the 2012 SHLAA (Appendix 3). The Site and the adjoining Site will not lead to the merging of Drighlington and Gildersome; and will not be contrary to one of the purposes of Green Belts to prevent coalescence of settlements.

### 3.5 Sustainability

3.6 Both Sites are in a very sustainable location, on the edge of the existing settlement of Drighlington, with all essential facilities within 1 000m of the Sites (Appendix 4).

3. 7 The site has excellent public transport links, with a regular bus service to Leeds and Bradford, trains departing from Morley and a key motorway connection to the M62 and M 1.

3.8 Both Sites would represent a sustainable extension to Drighlington.

### 3.9 Housing Requirements

3.10 Walton & Co has previously made representations to the Draft Core Strategy indicating that we believe that the housing requirement should be higher. The growth requirement set out in draft Spatial Policy 6 is significantly below that forecast in the 2008 based CLG household projections. It is not clear as to how this figure has been derived and upon what evidence it is based having regard to economic/demographic projections including migration.

3.1 1 Furthermore, there has been an undersupply of housing completions from 2008/09 onwards against the targets in the RSS. However, no calculation has been made in the housing requirement for this undersupply. It is considered that an allowance for the recent undersupply should be made in the housing figures.

3.12 Leeds District should make additional provision for the needs of neighbouring authorities where topography and lack of space preclude identification of sufficient housing land to meet their housing requirements. Paragraph 182 of the NPPF provides that in order to be sound a plan must, inter alia, be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities. Both Sites lie adjacent to the Leeds/Kirklees border and Kirklees are also going to have to review Green Belt in order to meet the housing requirements set out within their draft Core Strategy.

3.13 Drighlington is identified as being a "Smaller Settlement" within the Outer South West area of Leeds. Draft spatial policy 7 identifies that for Smaller Settlements 2,300 houses are to be delivered by infill and 5,200 by extension. Walton & Co have previously made representations to the Core Strategy indicating that there is no evidence to support this approach. The amount of infill will be significantly lower and therefore extensions must deliver greater

## General Comments

---

**Name: Clugston Developments Limited**

**Representor No: PRS06182**

numbers.

3.13 Both Sites would assist the Council in meeting its housing requirements, and provide the housing required in the Smaller Settlements, in accordance with Spatial Policy 10 (see section 2.3)

4. Deliverability

4.1 Both Sites are deliverable, being available now, in a suitable location and capable of being delivered within 5 years of adoption of the plan.

5. Contamination Issues/Deliverability of the Site

5.1 The Site has previously been used as a quarry and tip. Surveys have previously been carried out to ascertain whether development on the Site would be viable. At the time when these surveys were carried out viability was considered for employment uses. The surveys concluded that development of the site would be viable. Since then the methane gas has reduced on the Site (due to the passage of time) and the foundations for housing carry much lighter loads than foundations for commercial development which would be of benefit. The Site is therefore viable for housing development.

5.2 Modern materials and techniques mean that any ground condition issues can be satisfactorily engineered to meet current standards.

6. Conclusion

6.1 Both Sites should be released from Green Belt following the Green Belt review identified in Spatial Policy 10, as both Sites no longer serve their Green Belt purpose. Development of the Sites for housing would assist the Council in meeting its identified housing need.

6.2 Both Sites as a whole are located in a sustainable position on the edge of the Smaller Settlement of Drighlington, with all essential services within the locality.

6.3 Both Sites would assist the Council in meeting its housing requirements, and provide the housing required in the Smaller Settlements within the Outer South West area of Leeds. Therefore, in accordance with Spatial Policy 10 (see section 2.3)

6.4 The Site is deliverable, being available now, in a suitable location and capable of being delivered within 5 years of adoption of the plan.

---

**Name: Mark Burton**

**Representor No: PRS06183**

Representation ID: REP07075      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Any future house building in and around the Rawdon area threatens to destroy Rawdon as a village. The increase of traffic and population along with any loss of greenbelt land will reduce the quality of life of current residents. The local roads in particular will not be able to cope with increased volume of traffic.

---

**Name: Margaret Cook**

**Representor No: PRS06184**

Representation ID: REP07074      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Garforth will lose its identity if these schemes go ahead. The services are already stretched to the limit. Wildlife will suffer even more than it already is and will become almost non-existent. I see no merit to any of these developments and hope the planners will refuse permission.

---

**Name: Debbie Bennett**

**Representor No: PRS06188**

Representation ID: REP07079      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I object to housing development plans for green sites in LS19

Representation ID: REP07090      Question Ref: H1

Housing

I object to housing development plans for green sites in LS19

Representation ID: REP07121      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I object to housing development plans for green sites in LS19



# General Comments

---

**Name: Doreen Bedford**

**Representor No: PRS06191**

Representation ID: REP07080

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

How are we going to cope with all this building? It is bad now for access coming on to Westerton Road and Haigh Moor Road. Frost Corner is a nightmare crossing, no lights. This makes it very bad for children and old people. Lots more traffic on our roads. With all the building going on already the roads are always dirty and drains getting blocked with all the dirt going down the road?

We are losing our village we are going to be like a town s, with no facilities. I have been told Ardsley and Tingley will end up ben the size of Harrogate. Our roads and pavements get resurfaced, then more building goes pm, this makes them bad again. As they are dug into again for gas and electricity and water. Also on Westerton Road a heavy machine went into the road which had just been done, this had to be patched up. We have had one-way traffic again and again.

Our schools are over flowing now parents who have been born here are now finding their children are having to go to schools out of the area are new schools going to be built. Doctors are harder to see now, more people coming to the area means it will be harder still.

---

**Name: Barbara Bedford**

**Representor No: PRS06193**

Representation ID: REP07084

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

According to the plans, this area appears to have a large share of new housing development than anywhere else. WHY?

We were told that this was because of the close proximity to the motorways. As it not been considered that at peak times thee is so much traffic that there is often a wait before they can get on to the motorway.

There is a shortage of school in the area NOW with parents reporting they cannot get their children in to school. We have been swamped by new housing NOW. It is also difficult to get a GP appointment. There is a lack of facilities.

---

**Name: Michael Bedford**

**Representor No: PRS06195**

Representation ID: REP07089

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We have cant and share of housing and no lombet a village.

We were told that this was because we are close to (M1 –M62) to much traffic that there is often a wait before you get on.

Shortage of schools cannot get children into school and up to 3 weeks to see your GP

---

**Name: Judith Elliott**

**Representor No: PRS06197**

Representation ID: REP07094

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Each site named will all cause congestion with traffic \*\*\*\*\* on each of the main roads in Garforth I live on Lidgett Lane and my parent beofe i was born in Garforth. Why ruin a community when houses could be built elsewhere.

---

**Name: Maria Kilma**

**Representor No: PRS06199**

Representation ID: REP07096

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I own a farm wish up fee building land andd SHLSS sights.

---

**Name: Geoffrey Goodall**

**Representor No: PRS06200**

Representation ID: REP07098

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I would like to formally object to the plans to build houses on green land around Yeadon.

---

**Name: Mrs Penrose**

**Representor No: PRS06202**

Representation ID: REP07100

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I would like to formally object to the plans to build houses on green land around Yeadon.

# General Comments

**Name:** Pat Latty

**Representor No:** PRS06204

Representation ID: REP07101      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

In formulating our response to the consultation on the future development of Guiseley & Rawdon Ward we have gradually and over time hardened our original and long held opinion that Aireborough has had enough.

We believe that the principle of Leeds adopting a proper plan of where and when development can take place is basically sound. We are a growing City and want to continue to grow. Growth however must be for the benefit of local populations, not a reason to sacrifice them for the sake of developers who can see only the sites at the end of their collective noses rather than embrace the totality of Leeds. Why can they not rise to the challenge of taking on huge potential development sites of South and South Central Leeds? Sites where it is possible to create a new infrastructure rather than to strain past bursting point an infrastructure already bursting? If not then why did we link the M1 into this area?

The government wants to create a bottom up relationship with localities. It wants people to have some control over how their neighbourhoods develop and where. It wants them to be able to protect local character, to keep and create "places", not surely, to be party to the exact opposite, their destruction.

So, now to Aireborough. Over the last 15/20 years we have seen the gradual destruction of the industrial character of our townships. Factories have been knocked down like ninepins; Parkinson's, Shires, Silver Cross, Peats Mills, Greenwoods, the list goes on; gas and electric sites have gone, so too has our Grammar School, and notably one Hospital (High Royds); Naylor Jennings is going, all for the sake of more and more houses. And more importantly not one jot of improvement to our infrastructure.

Aireborough is defined by one thing, the A65. This road starts in Cumbria and reaches Aireborough via Skipton, Addingham, Burley –in-Wharfedale and then Menston. All these places send their populations to work in Leeds with perhaps a few going into Bradford. Their only route is the A65 and the only changes to that over this period is the addition of pedestrian crossings, traffic lights and a very big island in Guiseley known as the Gyratory. These, do not ease the flow, they slow it. Along this choked road we have built on every available site, and everyone living in these sites has to use the A65 to get anywhere.

All this development has, with the exception of two protected area of search (PAS) Sites, been on Brownfield land. Because of that the effects have been to increase the population without spreading our built boundaries.

What we are now expected to condone is the introduction of a further sixteen hundred (net) houses on Greenfield Sites. Sixteen hundred houses will mean approximately three thousand two hundred people. Those people will drive cars and the only way out of Aireborough is via the A65. To reach that road there will be a strain put onto the, in most cases, very narrow internal roads. Three thousand two hundred people will have quite a lot of children and at present we have local uproar because we do not currently have room in our Primary Schools for the children already here. Nor have we an easy solution to that problem. There is a lack of medical and particularly dental cover now. Parking is a perpetual headache, getting worse by the day. Recently we had two new major stores open in the retail park. This has resulted in vastly increased traffic and at weekends the A65 grinds to a halt.

As if all this is not sufficient, Bradford is likely to build several hundred houses in Derry Hill at Menston. The people living there will be Leeds facing, Bradford means nothing to Menston, so where will they all go? Onto the A65, into our schools, shops, parking spaces and so on.

Over the period of recent development it has been a struggle to get housing that is not just "off the shelf" but bears some relationship to the old townships we live in. Mostly we failed, apart from getting chimneys recognised as a must have. The factories that went were full of character, as was the housing for their workers. That remains, but it is usually at odds with the new build.

As we have said the essential character of Aireborough has been badly damaged but not completely lost. We still have some open space in and around the Townships but the proposals before us leave no area safe. Historic buildings in historic settings could be surrounded by new build, long distance views will disappear. Boundaries will get blurred and local pride will suffer a dreadful blow. Little London Conservation Area could be joined to Nether Yeadon, joined to Westfield Estate. You would probably be able to walk from Horsforth to Menston without seeing a field. Development on the green fields between Netherfield Road and the A65 would be another filling of a buffer gap. And Wills Gill could be another infill which would remove any green fields between Yeadon and Guiseley.

We have had development in spades. We are just about surviving but even without all this prospective building we are struggling. These proposals will change Aireborough forever and not for the benefit of anyone, not even the incomers.

Finally we say Think again, Leeds is a big place, you can find space for 2300 houses (gross) without laying a finger on Aireborough. Please do it.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Derek Roberts**

**Representor No: PRS06207**

Representation ID: REP07104      Question Ref: H12

Housing

[Comment removed]

Representation ID: REP07104      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Mr Derek Roberts, 20 Cotswold Drive, Garforth, LS25 2DB. Tel 0113 2862300. e-mail above.  
I did not receive information about the housing proposals until yesterday so I can't get a structured response to you by 29th. However I have some comments that you may care to take into account. I think that any incursion into green belt land is to be deplored. It is an easy way out for planners and especially for developers. To build another 4500 houses in Garforth will destroy the place. Main Street, the focus of the village is just not big enough to cope with all the extra people, adequate services are just not there. I am thinking of parking; will you try to solve that by introducing parking charges? Schools will not cope. Do you propose to build new schools or will it simply be a case of more portable classrooms? You have already sold a lot of the Academy's land for housing alongside Selby Road, so portable class rooms will have to go on either playgrounds or sportsfields – a wonderful legacy for the nation's success in The Olympics. What about transport? Have you worked out how many from the 4500 houses will need to travel by train from a station that already has no parking capacity left and access roads so are narrow as to create gridlock? Parking at Garforth medical centre just about copes with existing demand and with another say 10000 people how will especially older people be able to see a doctor if they can't park?

# General Comments

**Name: Cooper**

**Representor No: PRS06208**

Representation ID: REP07107      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Northgate Lane site 1252.

The Site Allocations Plan currently contains the following details relative to the Northgate Lane site:

- 1 The main retail centre in the outer north east area is Wetherby.
- 2 Collingham is being proposed as a new lower order local centre with details indicated on plan 6.2B.
- 3 The total housing target for outer north east as set out in the Core Strategy is 5,000 units (8% of the district wide total).
- 4 Once existing planning permissions and allocations shown on the Plans Proposals Map with a lime green colouration are subtracted, the residual requirement figure for the outer north east area is 3,933 units.
- 5 The Northgate Lane site (Reference no.1252) has been sieved out of the assessment process (removed from further consideration) as it is not within the settlement hierarchy.

## Site Allocations Plan Suggested Revisions

Within the context of the current Site Allocations Plan Content as it relates to the settlement of Linton and my clients site, it is requested that consideration be given to the following amendments to the Site Allocations Plan to recognise the appropriate potential of the site to provide an element of housing land supply for the outer north east area of the district.

1 It is requested that the site be included in the Local Plan Assessment process going forward. There is no justification for the site to have been sieved out at this stage of the process.

2 The following arguments are put forward in support of this position:

- i)The site is immediately adjacent to the north western residential fringe of the settlement of Linton. Linton is situated in extremely close proximity to the defined main urban area of Wetherby. The site slopes towards the built form of the settlement.
- ii)Due to the sites topography, boundary treatment, characteristics and relationship to existing built form, the land visually forms part of the settlement and a new greenbelt boundary would be more appropriately defined along the sites western boundary which is demarcated by a dense and heavily planted mature hedgerow interspersed with semi mature trees.

Beyond the western boundary of the site the character and appearance of the land form is distinctly different to my client's site relating to the open countryside to the west of the settlement of Linton.

iii)Linear residential development that has taken place along Wetherby Road establishes a clear relationship between the settlement of Linton and the main urban area of Wetherby.

iv)Linton is one of the few areas of the district capable of meeting the requirements of the upper end of the residential market and this is evidenced both by the nature of existing properties adjacent to the site as well as new build development that has been undertaken in the settlement over recent times.

v)The site has previously been seen by the City Council as part of the Unitary Development Plan Preparation Process as an appropriate housing allocation. It was indeed allocated specifically for housing within an early part of this process being seen as an appropriate rounding off to the settlement with the western boundary clearly defining the greenbelt edge. Whilst the site was eventually included within the greenbelt the UDP Inspector did conclude that the western boundary could be capable of acting as a satisfactory long term boundary to the greenbelt. Over the significant period of time that has elapsed since this assessment, the western boundary to the site has matured significantly and it is now considered would more than appropriately perform the function of an appropriate and defensible long term greenbelt boundary with the site being released for residential development.

vi)The housing land requirement for the outer north east area is significant. The residual requirement could be even greater than that identified as there is some doubt as to whether all of the existing planning permissions and allocations will indeed come forward. National Planning Policy emphasises the need for significant housing growth and it is vital that the supply for the outer north east area is made up of a range and mix of housing provision, including larger upper end market properties catering for the executive market, as well as lower cost housing for the local population. The illustrative scheme prepared for the site indicates that a range of property types would be capable of being delivered on the Northgate Lane site.

vii)No housing provision whatsoever is included for the settlement of Linton within the Site Allocations Plan and given the housing needs of the area, the proximity of the settlement to Wetherby and the proposal to create a new defined local centre in Collingham, this is considered to be an oversight in providing much needed residential provision in a sustainable and environmentally attractive location. There should therefore be a limited level of housing provision identified for the settlement of Linton. (Circa 25 dwellings in total).

viii)The identification of the Northgate Lane site and its allocation could, in association with development of The Ridge to the east of Northgate Lane, deliver highway and access improvements if required at Northgate Lane and Tib Garth and provide a new village green setting and open space provision in this location to the benefit of the settlement together with a mix of house types including an element of affordable housing provision.

ix)It is considered that the site performs no greenbelt function and its allocation for housing would not prejudice any of the five purposes of including land within the greenbelt. The western boundary of the site would provide the most appropriate defensible boundary for the greenbelt in the longer term and release the site for a small number of dwellings to enable an appropriate growth of the settlement of Linton. It is evident from the Local Plan Process that the City Council are undertaking a greenbelt review within the district and within the outer north east area. The principle of greenbelt boundary definition is therefore being considered and as such, it is requested that such action be taken with respect to the Northgate Lane site.

## Summary

My clients have undertaken a considerable amount of preparatory work demonstrating that the site is capable of providing a residential scheme. There are no matters that would preclude such a development which includes a small number of dwellings. The site is available, suitable and achievable. There is both the requirement for greenbelt boundary review and the release of green field sites to provide for the district housing land requirement figure and in the circumstances of the Northgate Lane site this can be achieved by:

- i) Removing the site from the greenbelt.
- ii) Allocating the site for housing with a green status colouration.
- iii) It is considered that a capacity of development for the site could be indicated at circa 15 dwellings reflective of the indicative layout plan prepared for the site.

# General Comments

**Name:** Clayton

**Representor No:** PRS06213

**Representation ID:** REP07113      **Question Ref:** H7

Housing

We act on behalf of our client, Mrs. Clayton, in respect of her and her family's landholdings within the jurisdiction of Leeds City Council. The focus of the landholding is within North Leeds, adjacent to the build up area of Cookridge. We therefore have the following comments to make in response to the Leeds City Council Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options consultation (June 2013).

## Housing Need and Demand

In terms of allocating sites for housing, the Site Allocations Plan needs to deliver the ambitious level of growth necessary to meet the Core Strategy housing target (66,000 homes over the plan period), as well as meeting the need for specialist accommodation. We recognise the focus on accommodating development within the settlement hierarchy.

The scale of housing required for delivery over the plan period has resulted in a necessary Green Belt review around the areas identified in policy SP10. This includes Leeds City Centre and the surrounding communities which form the main urban and suburban areas of the City (including Cookridge).

## North Leeds

North Leeds has been identified to accommodate 9% of the overall growth throughout the district during the plan period. It is therefore considered that in order to help address the residual target of 3,035 units in the North Leeds Area, appropriate parcels of land must be released from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development.

The North Leeds area is characterised by a number of distinctive communities which form part of the main urban area of Leeds. As set out above, our clients land is located immediately adjacent the built up area of Leeds within the Cookridge area. Please see the attached location plan for reference.

It is considered that the development of part or the whole of our client's site for residential development would help to deliver the much needed houses to meet the housing target over the plan period. (3,035 unit residual target for the North Leeds area after the deduction of existing supply (both allocations and permissions) which equates to approximately 202 new dwellings per annum).

## Site Assessment

Our client's land is currently identified as Green Belt and has not been proposed for development to date. However, as the Council is undertaking a Green Belt review, it is considered that this site will be wholly suitable for future allocation when considered against a number of other sites within the Green Belt. Please see below reasons as to why we consider the site suitable, available, achievable and deliverable for future residential development.

## SHLAA Assessment

Part of our client's land was previously identified as part of Site 3044 of the 2011 SHLAA assessment (a site identified as red in the consultation document). The site has been assessed in association with land identified as the nearby Golf Club, 'Cookridge Hall Golf and County Club'. It is important, however, for the Council to assess our client's land separately, rather than land which has been submitted by and associated with the Cookridge Hall Golf and County Club. We therefore urge

2

the Council to identify our clients land as an independent site to Site 3044. Our client's land is currently used for agricultural purposes, not leisure, and is distinctly separate. The land should therefore not bare the same constraint to future development as site 3044. We strongly request amendments to site boundary 3044 and a new site reference is provided in association with the land identified on the attached plan.

This is not to say that our client would not want to work with neighboring landowners if the opportunity presented itself. However, at this early stage of the Allocations process, it is vital that our client's land is assessed on its own merits and not tarnished with those constraints attached to the Golf Course.

## Site appraisal

The site is situated within a sustainable location, located adjacent to the built up area of Cookridge which forms part of the main urban area of Leeds. Access is available directly from Cookridge Lane and / or Pinfold Lane.

The site in question is approximately 5.6 hectares, however, if necessary it could be considered as three separate parcels of land. Parcel 1, to the north of the entire site, is circa 2.96 hectares, parcel 2 (south of parcel 1), is circa 1.6 hectares and, parcel 3 (south of parcel 2), is circa 1.0 hectares. Please see the attached plan for further detail.

Based on an average density of 30 dwellings per hectare, it is considered that the site as a whole is capable of accommodating around 160 – 170 dwellings.

However, this does not take into account any potential design constraints, open space requirements, or buffer areas etc. Final numbers would be discussed in greater detail with the Council during the preparation of a planning application.

The existing land use of the entire site is for agriculture (Grade 3 – moderate quality); however, due to its surrounding uses and the frustration of trespass, our client is not able to farm the site to its full potential. It is therefore becoming surplus to farming requirements and would be better suited to an alternative use.

This is why the site is now available for future development; particularly

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Clayton

**Representor No:** PRS06213

residential development.

The site is flat in topography and is considered wholly developable – covering approximately 5.5 hectares. However, we would be willing to discuss an exact site boundary in greater detail with the council, if required.

The site is bounded by trees and hedging to the west, south and east which form a strong natural boundary to prevent urban sprawl. There is also the neighboring land uses such as the sports fields and the Golf Club which provide a boundary to restrict further expansion in the area.

There are a few trees / shrubs located along the boundary between parcels 2 and 3. There is limited tree coverage on the site and is therefore considered to have limited adverse impacts on the future development of the site. Any proposed development would include the necessary arboricultural surveys and aim to retain as many trees as possible. The site is not within a Conservation Area and the site is not known to be subject to any Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's).

As there are limited arboricultural restrictions to the site, it is considered that there will be limited ecology restrictions with regard to the site coming forward.

Again, however, any planning application would be supported by the necessary ecology reports to enable the local planning authority to determine the outcome of an application in a detailed manner.

3

Not only does the site have strong natural boundaries, particularly to the east and south, the site includes two road frontages – Cookridge Lane and Pinfold Lane. Pinfold Lane is also within our client's ownership. The site is therefore readily accessible.

Due to the site being immediately adjacent to the built up environment of Cookridge, the site is in close proximity to a wide range of local services and facilities. These include: Cookridge Hall Golf and County Club, sports fields (cricket, football etc), a Health and Fitness club, Church of Holy Trinity Cookridge, Cookridge Village Hall, Cookridge Methodist Church, schools, an ASDA Supermarket and local shops. There is also nearby bus stops on Cookridge Drive and Green Lane and Horsforth Train Station. The site is therefore considered to not only have good access to the local highways, but also to public transport.

It is therefore considered that the site is a robust site to come forward for residential development during the plan period. Furthermore, our clients land is not within an area of high flood risk (please see the attached Environment Agency plan for reference). The site is not within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or national nature conservation designation and, is not within a minerals safeguarded site or within the airport safety zone.

Based on the above - and as the site falls within the settlement hierarchy of the Core Strategy - Leeds City Council should consider the site (as a whole or in part) as a suitable, available, achievable and deliverable site to accommodate future housing growth in the North Leeds Area and assess the land as part of a comprehensive Green Belt review.

The future development of the site would create an attractive, vibrant and successful place, promoting a long term sustainable community and delivering quality housing in an area of high market demand. Additional housing choice in the area is considered to be a benefit to local communities and to the district as a whole; helping meet the local housing needs and demands during the plan period. The scale of development in the area is not considered to be detrimental to the existing infrastructure and landscape and, relevant supporting documents would be used to support any future planning application, if deemed necessary by the planning authority.

The only limitation to bringing the site forward for development in the short term is its location within the Green Belt. However, it is considered that this site does not add to the Green Belt or comply with the 5 purposes identified in the NPPF for identifying land to be designated as Green Belt. Development of the site would not lead to the unrestricted sprawl of large built up area (please see above for further detail). The development of the site would not lead to neighboring towns merging together. The site is not valuable countryside and is only Grade 3 (moderate) agricultural land. The site does not preserve the setting and special character of a historic town. Finally, the development of the site would help address the housing need and demand in the area without having an adverse impact on urban regeneration as the site is not located in close proximity to a major regeneration area.

In the 2011 SHLAA some of our clients land was assessed as part of Site 3044. This site was not considered suitable for development as the Council considered the site not to be well related to the existing settlement form and development of a site this size would represent a significant incursion into Green Belt which could set a precedent for further unrestricted sprawl. We therefore ask for our clients

4

land to be independently assessed. The scoring in the Sustainability Appraisal of Site 3044 is considered to strongly relate to the site being an existing leisure facility. As our clients land is used for agricultural purposes only, it is considered that it would score higher than Site 3044. We therefore urge the Council to reassess the land and identify the site as a 'green', suitable site to accommodate future residential development.

Notwithstanding the site's Green Belt allocation, the land is a sustainable,

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Clayton

**Representor No:** PRS06213

deliverable site for future residential development and its delivery would not have a significant detrimental impact on the local environment. Our client wishes to bring the site forward for development given that it can no longer be effectively used for agriculture. There are no tenants on the site or any buildings which would require clearing or demolition. It is therefore available in the short to medium term allocation and would generate significant market interest.

**Phasing**

We acknowledge that phasing of sites will take place at a later stage of the plan; however, it is considered that our clients land is available for short to medium term development.

**Safeguarding Land**

There is also the need to safeguard land for future development. It is vital that the council provides sufficient land for long term development to ensure long term endurance of the Green Belt boundaries and provide a reserve of potential sites for longer term development needs beyond the plan period. This is in line with Policy SP10 of the Core Strategy.

**Conclusion**

All or part of our client's landholding is suitable and deliverable for residential development over the plan period and should be transparently considered as part of a robust Green Belt Review. We do not believe that the site should be grouped with other uses. Our client's sites (please see attached plans for reference), would represent an appropriate and well contained extension to the settlement boundary and are of no special character that can be developed in keeping with surrounding properties. The sites are ideally placed to provide the flexible and continuous supply of housing land that national and local guidance requires. We therefore request that the site boundary is redrawn (independently to Site 3044), and assessed on its individual merits using the knowledge and information set out above.

5

Our client, Mrs. Clayton, would like to work closely and in partnership with the Council to support and help deliver sustainable growth in North Leeds.

It is considered that the land identified on the attached plan should be allocated for residential development and therefore removed from the Green Belt designation.

We should be pleased if these sites would be taken into account during the preparation of the Site Allocations Document and would ask that we are kept informed of all future consultations during the Plan process.

We would welcome the opportunity to meet with the relevant planning officers to discuss the site in further detail in respect of delivery and look forward to hearing from the Council in due course.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Edwin Woodhouse & Co Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS06215**

Representation ID: REP07118      Question Ref: R3

Retail

CFSMO51 green  
and the additional land in my clients ownership is 4048.

The Sunny Bank Mills site is specifically identified as a mixed use site under City Council Reference no.CFSMO51 (3.35 hectares) with a green status colouration for residential, retail and employment uses. [Representation sets out Site Allocs comments relating to the site].

My clients also own site Reference no.4048 (referred to as Bryan Street, Farsley). The site assessment work undertaken for this site identifies the land as the south eastern position of a site taken up with parking area for adjacent office conversion. Access to the heavily wooded remainder of the site is extremely limited. No access to highway. The site is identified with a red status colouration within the plan.

My clients appointed a full design team some time ago to prepare a masterplan for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Sunny Bank Mills site and discussions have been advanced with City Council Officers over a significant period of time with general agreement having been reached on a mixed use scheme. The contents of the Site Allocations Plan largely reflect the tenor and details of these discussions which is welcomed by my clients. It is envisaged that an outline planning application will be submitted later this year as preapplication discussions have been underway for the last few months in relation to the comprehensive masterplan proposal. I enclose a copy of the current masterplan scheme for information. Supporting assessment work is being undertaken as part of this process considering aspects such as highways and access, ecology and landscaping. Once available, further details will be submitted to supplement this representation.

## Site Allocations Plan Suggested Revisions

As a general comment my clients welcome the identification of the Sunny Bank Mills site as a mixed use development opportunity with a green status colouration relative to a range of land uses including residential, retail and employment uses. (Reference CFS/MO51). However, rather than being treated as a separate entity Site Reference 4048 should be added into the overall Sunny Bank Mills site reference to reflect title ownership boundaries and the masterplan work underway. It is requested that the proposed Site Allocations DPD boundary amendment indicated on Plan 11.2D (Farsley Town Centre) be revised to reflect my clients precise ownership boundaries of Sunny Bank Mills. It is considered that this would be logical relative to the future planning application and masterplan processes envisaged and their relationship to the Local Plan as it progresses.

Acknowledgement of the Sunny Bank Mills site's scope for some comparison retail development is noted and welcomed. It is however considered that the site also has potential for convenience goods retailing as part of an overall mixed use scheme and it is requested that this be acknowledged within the text of the plan.

The site will provide a significant level of residential development to assist with meeting the residual requirement target for the outer west area. As the masterplan discussions advance over the coming months, a more definitive idea of dwelling numbers will emerge and my clients will supplement this representation with this information to provide additional certainty to the City Council and the Local Plan process.

Mixed Use Allocation Reference no.CFSMO51 is welcomed by my clients as is the green colouration relating to residential, retail and employment uses. My clients would however request that as part of the emerging mixed use scheme other supporting ancillary uses be acknowledged as appropriate for the site including A use and D use provision as they relate to the Use Classes Order. As part of the preparatory work underway on the masterplan proposal for the site, aspects of highways and access, ecology and landscaping are all being given careful consideration.

Further information will be submitted to supplement this representation in due course to demonstrate that all of the technical and infrastructure matters associated with redeveloping the site can be appropriately addressed and that in terms of availability, suitability and achievability, the Sunny Bank Mills site represents a short term, significant opportunity to deliver a comprehensive mix of uses to the benefit both of Farsley Town Centre and its wider area. Key environmental features within the Sunny Bank Mills site will be properly addressed as part of this assessment.

---

**Name: Barbara Hardaker**

**Representor No: PRS06228**

Representation ID: REP07135      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I wish to make it known that I am opposed to development of greenbelt sites and also opposed to greenfield development until all other options are properly considered, whether for housing or retail use. The council should be considering the numerous brownfield sites available as well as bringing back into use the many empty properties. The number of new housing developments going on at the moment is hugely excessive and it is inconceivable that so many houses are actually necessary. There are many sites where building has ceased because the houses already built are not selling. The need the city has is for social housing and not private or so-called "affordable" homes. The consultation needs to take these facts into account when making a decision that will affect the whole of the population of Leeds for many years.



# General Comments

<b>Name: K P Martin</b>		
<b>Representor No: PRS06231</b>		
Representation ID: REP07136	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
I have worries that building in north west Leeds is not thought though and these good examples of build now think later		

<b>Name: Clive Fox</b>		
<b>Representor No: PRS06234</b>		
Representation ID: REP07145	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
Ref 7 Former All Saints school Bridge St Otley		
Colour coding green – supported		
Comment: the site is in urgent need of redevelopment and well placed for retirement flats/sheltered housing. Office use would be inappropriate in a location which is essentially a residential area. The residential capacity is likely to prove to be in excess of the 14 units shown		

# General Comments

---

**Name: Ian Smith**

**Representor No: PRS06235**

Representation ID: REP07297      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Site 181 - This adjoins the boundary of the Holbeck Conservation Area and adjacent to the Grade II Listed former Marshall Mills Schoolroom. If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets are not harmed.

Representation ID: REP07313      Question Ref: General comment

Employment

2002611 There are a number of Listed Buildings to the north of this site (the Round House (Grader); the half Round House and the former Railway Repair Shop (both Grade II). There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, any development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.

Representation ID: REP07313      Question Ref: General comment

Employment

2002369 This site lies within the Holbeck Conservation Area. There are high-grade Listed Buildings along its eastern edge (the Grade II\* Marshall Mills and the flax Warehouse to Marshall Mills) and to the south (the Grade I Listed Temple Mill, its Grade II\* Gate Lodge, and Grade II Schoolroom)

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 Listed Buildings are not harmed. They would also need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the character of this part of the Conservation Area are not harmed.

Representation ID: REP07313      Question Ref: General comment

Employment

2004519 There are a number of Listed Buildings to the north of this site (the Round House (Grade II\*); the half Round House and the former Railway Repair Shop (both Grade II). There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, any development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.

Representation ID: REP07352      Question Ref: H1

Housing

There are three Grade II Listed Buildings to the east and south of this area (The Grange, its Coach House and Service Range and the Cricketer's Arms). There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, redevelopment proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets are not harmed.

Representation ID: REP07426      Question Ref: H1

Housing

This site includes the Upper Wortley Primary School a Grade II Listed Building. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, any development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Ian Smith**

**Representor No: PRS06235**

Representation ID: REP07431      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Sustainability Appraisal - As you will be aware, in terms of the historic environment, on the whole, we considered that the Scoping Report identified the majority of plans and programmes which are of relevance to the development of the DPD, that it had established an appropriate Baseline against which to assess the Plan's proposals and that it put forward a suitable set of Objectives and Indicators. Overall, therefore, we believed that it provided the basis for the development of an appropriate framework for assessing the significant effects which the DPD might have upon the historic environment. We are pleased to note that the comments which we made about the Scoping Report have been incorporated into this latest iteration of the document. We have the following comments to make on the content of the document:-

Table 3 SA21 - • There are a number of sites which could impact upon other designated heritage assets. These include Historic Parks and Gardens and Scheduled Monuments. The potential impact upon these assets should form part of the assessment.

• National policy guidance makes it clear that the significance of a heritage asset can be harmed through development within its setting. The setting of an asset is defined in the NPPF as the surroundings in which an asset is experienced. For some assets, their setting can be quite extensive (i.e. it is not simply limited to land in its immediate vicinity). From the Assumptions set out for SA21 and the scoring, it is would appear that the assessment has not adequately evaluated the impact which the development of some of the sites might have upon the setting of the assets in its vicinity.

Table 4 —environmental - Many of the areas which have been put forward lie within, or would impact environmental upon the setting of, one of the many Conservation Areas within the District. In order to ensure that the likelihood of harm is minimised, this section should be suggesting a number of mitigation measures:-

(1 ) Conservation Area Appraisals — This would help to improve the confidence that the DPD would deliver a more positive outcome for the historic environment by two means:-

a. Several of the areas which have been put forward as possible allocations lie within, or would impact upon the setting of, one of Rotherham's Conservation Areas. An up-to-date Conservation Area Appraisal for each of the settlements where sites are being proposed for development would assist the Council in determining whether or not the allocation of these sites would be likely to harm elements which contribute to the character or setting of these areas. It would also help to determine what mitigation might be adopted and the most appropriate form of development for each particular site.

b. The production of up-to-date Conservation Area Appraisals which clearly identify the elements which contribute to the significance of those areas would help to ensure that future development proposals are delivered in a manner which safeguards their character.

(2) Listed Buildings - In view of the 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, for those sites which are likely to involve the loss and subsequent development of currently undeveloped land in their vicinity, there should be an assessment of the likely impact that this might have upon the significance of the building.

Appendix 6 - In our representation to the plan we have highlighted a number of sites which could impact upon the significance of the heritage asset of the Plan area. In virtually all cases, the likely impact of the development of these sites, at this stage, is uncertain and for most will require further evaluation. However, for most of these, the Sustainability Appraisal against SA21(historic environment) records that it will have "no effect". This is clearly not the case. It is suggested that the sites are reviewed again in the light of our representations on the DPD and the comments above..

Appendix 7 - The conclusions about the impact of the development of the various sites against SA21 (historic environment) needs to be reconsidered in the light of the above comments.

English Heritage strongly advises that the conservation section of the Council and archaeological staff at VVYAS are closely involved throughout the preparation of the SA of this DPD. They are best placed to advise on; local historic environment issues and priorities, including access to data held in the HER (formerly SMR); how the policy or proposal can be tailored to minimise potential adverse impacts on the historic environment; the nature and design of any required mitigation measures; and opportunities for securing wider benefits for the future conservation and management of historic assets.

This opinion is based on the information provided by you in the document accompanying your letter dated 31 May 2013 and, for the avoidance of doubt, does not affect our obligation to advise you on, and potentially object to any specific development proposal which may subsequently arise from this or later versions of the plan which is the subject of consultation, and which may, despite the SA/SEA, have adverse effects on the environment.

---

**Name: Colin Sutton**

**Representor No: PRS06236**

Representation ID: REP07147      Question Ref: H10

Housing

If you still insist on going ahead why not use the site on Ridge Road [Garforth] which you were going to do a few years ago.

---

**Name: M Wilson**

**Representor No: PRS06239**

Representation ID: REP07150      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

1669 - My Prime concern is the conversion of Green Belt for building purposes. The Golf Club application involves building on flood plans, photos are available to illustrate this statement and fails to meet the local requested of smaller homes for people downsizing.

# General Comments

**Name: Deborah Hill**

**Representor No: PRS06240**

Representation ID: REP07153      Question Ref: RVol1

Retail

Our answer to

RVol1 1 "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? "

is Yes. In answer to the second part of the question:

"If so, what would you consider a reasonable definition of a large store?"

we are not qualified to put a figure on the size, but suggest it might be a minimum of three to four times the size of the average shop.

Representation ID: REP07153      Question Ref: CCR1

Retail

The boundary should be extended in the east to include all the land to the inner ring road. This is a much clearer dividing line between potential city centre uses and Hunslet.

Representation ID: REP07153      Question Ref: CCR2

Retail

The city centre should allow for mixed uses. There should be no zoning with the exception of the primary shopping area.

Representation ID: REP07153      Question Ref: CCR6

Retail

Yes

Representation ID: REP07153      Question Ref: CCR7

Retail

These are all existing centres which have grown up because of a local need. Where are the convenience centres to serve the existing and future residential and office populations south of the river?

Representation ID: REP07153      Question Ref: CCR8

Retail

Bridge End  
New Dock  
Holbeck Urban Village  
Crown Point

If they don't fit with the sequential definition, change the definition.

(A plan of the whole city centre showing the Local Convenience Centres would have been helpful.)

Representation ID: REP07153      Question Ref: CCR9

Retail

Agree

Representation ID: REP07153      Question Ref: General comment

Retail

RETAIL:

Whilst the city centre and perhaps some town centres have a buoyant retail economy, many of our town and local centres are in crisis and need fresh thinking on uses to allow them to thrive again. Here cafes and other active uses in the heart of a centre can add life to a place where buildings are struggling to find retail users. Many upper floors of most centres are vacant or under-used and allowing other types of use there – professional premises or residential particularly can create activity in an area otherwise dead in the evenings.

In principle, then, we believe that most centres, with the exception certainly of the city centre, should not have a separated primary and secondary frontage policy.

We do agree that larger anchor stores particularly small supermarkets within a town or local centre are useful and should be retained.

Representation ID: REP07160      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Most of the amber sites could be green. Many of these are only limited because too much greenfield land is going to be available. If greenfield land were more restricted, there would be more incentive to make use of these sites.

Representation ID: REP07160      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Yes, but others could be included

Representation ID: REP07160      Question Ref: H4

Housing

Most of the land to the east of Crown Point Retail Park up to John Smeaton Way, (with the exception, perhaps, of the three large users there), could be amber. As the demand for family housing in the city centre grows, owners of this land will no doubt be looking at residential development. The only allowance the Plan makes for this to happen is by saying it would be windfall land. Some attempt should be made to direct the location of potential changes of land use from employment to residential to where it would be most appropriate. Leaving it entirely to the whim of individual landowners will lead to the same problem experienced with the city centre apartment boom – no structure, no vision, just piecemeal development dotted around the city often in inappropriate locations.

# General Comments

**Name: Deborah Hill**

**Representor No: PRS06240**

Representation ID: REP07160	Question Ref: H4	Housing
-----------------------------	------------------	---------

Yes, for the most part.

Representation ID: REP07160	Question Ref: H7	Housing
-----------------------------	------------------	---------

Yes

Representation ID: REP07160	Question Ref: H7	Housing
-----------------------------	------------------	---------

No

Representation ID: REP07160	Question Ref: H10	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------	---------

See above

See also representation submitted for full details

Representation ID: REP07160	Question Ref: H11	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------	---------

All sites in the city centre should be developed as soon as possible

Representation ID: REP07160	Question Ref: H13	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------	---------

This question needs to await the needs assessment, and in doing so it should be borne in mind that the needs of travelling showpeople and gypsy/travellers are very different.

Representation ID: REP07160	Question Ref: H14	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------	---------

No. Elderly housing accommodation should not be segregated from other housing. They should, however, be located as close as possible to the facilities they need.

Representation ID: REP07160	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

The selection of sites appears to have been a purely reactive process to sites put forward by landowners and developers. With the exception of the Core Strategy decision to distribute housing land through the city, there seems to have been no positive forward planning that has considered how site allocations can assist in making the localities in which they are situated better places as a result. Proactive planning would have assessed the localities and the settlement qualities first and allocated land where it could make a positive contribution to the life of that place. By not considering sites that have not been put forward by a landowner, it is possible that better sites have been overlooked.

Because the selection of sites is based on what landowners have put forward, inevitably most sites are greenfield because they are cheaper to build on. The Document does not provide any information on the split between the two, but it is clearly not sustainable, either environmentally, socially or economically over the long term, to provide most housing on greenfield sites.

Picking up our comment made under "retail" above, a primary goal should be to bring under-used properties into use, particularly in the city centre and in local centres above existing shops and other premises.

On the question of provision for the elderly, we do not believe this group should be segregated from other members of the community. Clearly some sites closer to local facilities will be more attractive to those who are more restricted in their ability to move around, but the aim should be to encourage mixed communities, and greater social cohesion.

The greenbelt assessment tool is well-designed and a useful check on whether an allocated site would meet the required tests of greenbelt policy. It would therefore have been useful to have the existing greenbelt boundary marked on the housing site maps for easier interpretation of how it might be affected by them. The analysis tool is totally dependent on the interpretation which in some cases is questionable. As an example, Site nos.1190, 3315, 4013, 2063 within the Roundhay Park greenbelt and urban green corridor, have all been coloured amber rather than red following an incomplete, and in parts incorrect, analysis of the purpose of the greenbelt wedge in that location, resulting in a complete misunderstanding of its importance and value.

No allowance has been made for the numbers of dwellings that could be achieved in the upper levels of existing buildings throughout the city centre and particularly the retail core.

The numbers of dwellings in the schemes is said to be related to the SHLAA guidance on density, but reduced to allow for larger apartments and houses which might be suitable for families. We support this, even though it would reduce the total numbers as we believe the market for smaller units will be much more limited in the future and the need and demand will be for family housing. The arrival of a secondary academy in City Centre South will be a catalyst for such development, as currently promoted by the Leeds Sustainable Development Group. However, the actual numbers allocated to each site does not bear this out, and on calculation still appears to be around or about the 350pph figure, rather than half that.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Sue Hill**

**Representor No: PRS06242**

Representation ID: REP07152      Question Ref: H4

Housing

I would like to register my objection to further development in and around Farsley, specifically Kirklees Knoll. Our road systems are at breaking point, the schools are full, there are no enough doctors or dentists.

I realise that people would have looked at drainage but have they looked at it properly, Farsley has springs and becks and when it rains we get flooding, when more concrete is added, this water has no-where to go and the floods will become a more common occurrence.

Apprently the Clariant site in Pudsey has got planning consent which will add another 400 plus houses, at two cars per household, you do the maths. If Kirklees Knoll gets the go ahead then that's another 300 plus houses, at two cars per household, you've just added another 1400 cars to the roads around here. Farsley is already used as a cut through to avoid Dawson's corner, Kirklees Knoll is not derelict land but high grade grazing land and this is the only thing that separates Farsley from Rodley, both villages would effectively lose their village character. They have already built further down the hill to Kirklees Knoll and the traffic to get out at Bagley land and onto the ring road at Rodley roundabout is absolutely horrendous with many vehicles using the houses alongside the canal as a shortcut, at dangerous speeds, add more cars to this and there is going to be a major lose of life. The loss of this land would also have a detrimental effect on the local tenant farmer.

I also know that the drains down to Rodley, the river and canal have historically had surface water and sewage drainage problems and adding more houses would only make this worse.

I urge you to reconsider pulling up what is effectively green belt. There is much derelict land in and around Leeds/Bradford and once the road infrastructure is addressed then it should be this land which is used and not green fields (whether they are or are not green belt).

Thank you for listening and I beg you to come to Farsley and around Leeds and look for yourself, not just on a map and looking at reports which may or may not be telling the whole truth.

---

**Name: JI Dixon-parker**

**Representor No: PRS06245**

Representation ID: REP07156      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Over-intensification.

Whilst it is recognised that there is a demand for new housing, we believe that this should be distributed fairly and appropriately throughout the whole of the Leeds area. It appears from the Leeds Development Framework that over 10% of the total amount of housing proposed is planned for the Tingley and West Ardsley area. This cannot be a fair or sensible distribution.

In the immediate locality of the above sites there has been very significant house building in recent years (and with no proper investment in or improvement to infrastructure or amenities). It is disappointing that the Local Authority has already seen fit to grant permission in this area for so many houses lacking in basic design integrity. Currently there is permission/allocation for over 100 more units however with the inclusion of the above sites this would increase the building by in excess of 600 houses within an area of less than 1 square mile. This level of over-intensification is not acceptable and will promote urban sprawl and inappropriately join up the areas of Tingley, West Ardsley and East Ardsley

We would challenge the Council's data in relation to the calculation of the need for additional housing in the Tingley and West Ardsley (and East Ardsley) area and look forward to receiving details about how this need was identified and how the quota of over 10% of housing for the Leeds area came to be allocated for Tingley and West Ardsley.

Representation ID: REP07156      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Generally

In addition, we would also like to raise an objection to the consultation process itself and in particular the lack of direct contact with the many homes that are immediately adjacent to these development sites. It has become apparent that there are numerous people totally unaware of what is being proposed. The LCC web site to which we have been directed in order to lodge our objections is overly complicated and confusing. The Council has a responsibility both to promote and facilitate the comments of residents. They have failed to do this.

Finally we recognise that there is a need for more housing but the site selection criteria must be robust and well thought out with a view to long term sustainability; even if this requires additional but associated infrastructure. Building on green field sites is an easy option to achieve the desired numbers but is simply not acceptable. At best displays a lack of vision and responsibility to the environment and puts financial gain ahead of the environment and countryside and the quality of life and safety of people already residing in the area.

I look forward to being kept advised of the next stage of the consultation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Barbara Hart Barbara Hart**

**Representor No: PRS06252**

Representation ID: REP07167      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We wish to raise our objections to any potential medium/large scale housing developments in the Rawdon area. The two main reasons are:

1) Practical Issues

The area is already heavily saturated with traffic and simply would be unable to cope with large numbers of additional houses - new houses inevitably means firstly lots of large construction vehicles, then generally followed by at least 2 cars per household these days.

Where is all this traffic supposed to go, other than on to the already heavily congested A65 & A659 which can each have a solid build up of traffic throughout the day, certainly during morning and evening? Despite its narrowness as the centre of the old village, Town St has also become very busy over the past few years, due to now being used as a regular "cut-through" for speeding emergency service vehicles, general traffic avoiding the A65 congestion and it's speed cameras, increasingly also heavy lorries, plus the recent expansion of school facilities.

The bus service is very slow due to traffic congestion, plus the circuitous route of the no 97, and there is no adequate local rail system - the nearest stop is Horsforth which means driving to the station, but there is inadequate parking which results in local residents there being already seriously affected.

The area is already heavily affected by the proximity of LBA and its expansion plans. There is much talk of the expansion of the airport access road, but we are told this will be several years away. Potentially houses could be built on land which might be better suited to easing the airport access?

Within Rawdon land there are underground artesian wells, plus streams etc, which will inevitably have an impact on new building. We already saw various problems with drainage when Lakeside development was built, as the drainage system was simply inadequate to cope with increased demand.

On one hand we are being encouraged to support our high streets in the local vicinity and we try to do so wherever possible, however we cannot support them if we cannot get there.

2) Environmental and Land Issues

It is vital to maintain the status of existing Greenbelt and Greenfield areas in order to prevent urban sprawl. Rawdon is a historic Domesday village, which only just manages to retain it's separation from Horsforth and Yeadon. These clear boundaries must be maintained.

Much work is being done generally to promote healthy living - we need to keep open spaces to encourage young and old alike to continue to enjoy recreation and exercise in open fresh air. Rawdon's open spaces are already well used by the community. Increased traffic means increased pollution, which is also very bad for public health.

It is also vital to conserve our British wildlife and do all we can to encourage their habitats. Too many species are already diminishing in other parts of the UK due to building work and urban sprawl. Rawdon already enjoys various species of native wildlife. In addition, increased light pollution from streetlights is proven to be detrimental to birds.

We trust that you will take our opinions into account when considering the matter.

---

**Name: Peter And Ann Smith**

**Representor No: PRS06253**

Representation ID: REP07170      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Dear Sir/Madam,

Having studied the local development plan for housing allocations in the Calverley and Farsley area of Leeds, I find it incredulous that you would even consider housing developments of such size before addressing our well documented infra structure problems. Traffic in these areas is already a major problem to say the least. The village of Calverley particularly almost resembles a car park during rush hour periods, the same could be said of Rodley and the Farsley bypass A647. The proposed sites will only bring further intolerable congestion to these areas.

Education is another area that should be addressed before any further planning applications are considered. The villages of Calverley, Rodley and Farsley have hardly increased there school capacities since my wife and I were at school during the 1950's and 1960's.

Drainage is another which issue which should be addressed before any further planning is considered. We already have major problems with surface water flooding in the areas already mentioned.

---

**Name: Brian Johnson**

**Representor No: PRS06255**

Representation ID: REP07169      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

i brian johnson 11a st johns way yeadon and mary winfield of 15 st johns way strongly oppose to the developments above. this area cannot take any more traffic, and is gridlocked daily. there is a total lack of infrastructure to support these houses and the loss of any more greenbelt is totally wrong i trust you take all these points into account at the next meeting.

# General Comments

Name: Mary Winfield Mary Winfield

Representor No: PRS06258

Representation ID: REP07173      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

i brian johnson 11a st johns way yeadon and mary winfield of 15 st johns way strongly oppose to the developments above. this area cannot take any more traffic, and is gridlocked daily. there is a total lack of infastructure to support these houses and the loss of any more greenbelt is totally wrong i trust you take all these points into account at the next meeting. yours b johnson.



# General Comments

Name: Karen Dales

Representor No: PRS06260

Representation ID: REP07176      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

As a Scholes villager I would like to comment on the sites put forward for site allocations I understand that is inevitable due to future housing needs in Leeds that development will take place throughout the city in the next 15 years. I do feel that there are a number of sites which the developers are sitting on now that could be used but need clearing first (Brown field sites). I feel that they are cherry picking the sites which will make them more profit the sites which are classed as shovel ready, that are our Greenland and green belt, they should be made to use all other sites first, before taking the prime agricultural land for building. We can never get it back when we have used, it will be lost for ever, We can't make it. We have to feed the next generation.

Who decided that Leeds needs 66,000 dwellings?

Who produced these figures and is this information available for the public, if not why not?

Comparable cities of Birmingham and Sheffield have a considerably lesser number of developments planned why has Leeds got more?

There should be a review to ascertain a more realistic population growth figure so a true number of dwellings can be built,

The national planning policy framework (NPPF), the five year supply is at the heart of the many of the current planning decisions being made which are perceived to be undermining the very ethos of localism.

As Leeds has had 12 planning appeals which they have lost, due to the five year supply not being there, the developers consultants will put in an objection to the 66,000 and this could be raised by 20% according to the NPPF that says "where there has been an record of persistent under delivery of housing" the buffer should be increased to 20%. What constitutes 'persistent under-delivery' is a matter for debate at a planning appeal but as Leeds have lost a number of appeals already be prepared for the numbers to rise significantly these numbers need reviewing.

My concerns for the village are listed below

Scholes is a small rural village with character and identity its separated from the urban sprawl of Leeds by a small strip of agricultural land, site allocations numbers 797 is going to impact on us with the East Leeds Orbital road cutting through the agricultural land making the strip even smaller, with the addition of 843 houses on the PAS land (2143) in the first phase and a further 2527 houses (1271) and the smaller sites like wood lane with 59 (1061) the village will become just another sprawling characterless large suburb of Leeds The site allocations suggests a significant and disproportionate amount of building to our village which will impact on our health and wellbeing.

Medical centre

Medical centre the village currently has limited medical facilities with there only being one practice in the village located in a converted house with limits to disabled assess will fund holders be able to make provision for a minimum of 7000 patients (Estimate 2 per house hold)

Schools

The village school currently has adequate placing for the local area the nursery is over subscribed as people are appealing as they are being placed outside the village. If we get substantially more houses the school would need more class rooms and teachers the school was asked by the NDP if it could accommodate any more children the answer was 45 to 60 children if classrooms are provided the facilities need is based on the new build requirements and education legislation.

Busses

The bus service if you can call it that, we get one bus a hour if it's not cancelled or knocks they are not reliable you can not expect to catch a bus and get back, the buses are so unreliable. We have to use the car so we know we will be back in time, to pick the children up from school.

Roads and transport

The current roads cause problems at peak times the roundabout on the Barwick road at St Theresa's is a nightmare you have to allow extra time to get out up to ten minutes,

The junction at the A64 queuing traffic to turn left to Leeds and the sheer volume of traffic on the trunk road causes delays, if turning right to York its very dangerous and you block the road for people turning left due to the width of the junction. I tend to travel to Aberford and come out on the roundabout to travel to York

Drainage and storm drains

The current drainage and storm drains are inadequate for the village this has is apparent over the last few years as whenever we have had any rain the drain covers are up outside the church and peoples house have been flooded on Main Street, Belle Vue Avenue cannot cope with the volume of water if more than a shower of rain it just floods, the same outside the village shop on Rakehill road, the coronation tree junction floods as well as

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Karen Dales

**Representor No:** PRS06260

Leeds road, we have had the dykes cleared out on Leeds road so the water can collect in the dyke before moving on but this is only a small section all dykes should be kept clear.

Are the developers going to sort out the current problems with the drains before they start to add to the problem with more houses our Victorian drains will not take the amount of houses they are proposing to put up.

Will the developers fund this.

Property values

The property values will be affected by development as they are currently higher than other areas due to the village being a desirable area to live in. If higher end detached properties are built and this is what the developers suggested due to the desirability, saleability, profitability of the area. We have enough four bed detached and need smaller houses so younger people and the older residents can move to smaller houses and then free up the larger house in turn.

Allotments

We have had allotments for seventy years they are private allotments it's very hard to get one as there is a waiting list, they seem to have left them of the green space in your plan please can they be added to the green space /Allotment. We would like to keep them but as usual there under a site allocation for building

Site allocation 2134

843 houses I do not believe the site should take that many houses I think the roads and the surrounding area will be spoilt the access to the site is not great, access on main street is on a bend on main street as is you take your life in your hands when trying to leave the drive now so, with the speed as they come up the street,

Rake Hill road the bridge will have to be removed this is part of our character and identity.

If as suggested by GMI and the UDP 2006 there will be a road that comes from the A64 into the village that's was the only way the UDP would allow the land to be taken out of the green belt and made into PAS if we get a road it will cause a rat run through our village.

Gypsies and traveller

Gypsies and traveller sites we have nowhere appropriate.

I am not against travellers but we are a small village and when they are around things go missing.

To sum up as time is running out I feel that an Impact assessment should be carried out before any decisions are taken as the character and identity of our village is under threat. I thought the localism bill would help us get what we wanted but instead we are still being told what we have to have the numbers as I have said earlier do not add up the developers will be asking for more as they usually do and Leeds will have to give in and give them what they want, as five year supply not there.

We want an impact assessment done it is our local environment that will suffer our health and wellbeing our character and identity.

---

**Name:** Jeff, Sue Rayson

**Representor No:** PRS06275

Representation ID: REP07194

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We would like to submit a formal objection to the proposed building of hundreds of houses on various sites in the vicinity of the JCT roundabout at Yeadon.

The reasons for our objection are as follows:-

1. It would completely spoil the countryside that we currently enjoy in the Yeadon area.
  2. Traffic on the A65 and A658 is already at an unacceptable level due to the building that has taken place in the Yeadon/Guiseley area over the last few years and it will make it even more difficult for people to commute (either by car or public transport) if more houses are built. Over the past few years the bus service between Leeds and Yeadon (New Road) has been drastically cut which has made it more difficult for people who work in Leeds (including me) to get to work. I have to catch a bus at 7 a.m. to make sure I get to work in the centre of Leeds at 9 a.m. due to the shortage of buses and the build-up of traffic after 7 a.m.
  3. Building more houses will have an enormous impact on local services, i.e. schools, doctors' surgeries, dentists and hospitals, together with the ambulance and fire services.
- We would be grateful if you could consider the above points with a view to rejecting any further planning permission in the area.

# General Comments

Name: Sarah Lewis

Representor No: PRS06276

Representation ID: REP06596      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing to officially lodge my objection for the proposed house building planned for the Aireborough district of Leeds.

According to official council documents it is proposed 320 new houses are to be built within a square mile radius of the JCT roundabout (A65) along with a further 350 houses on the fields surrounding the Warm Lane area (just off the A65).

I completely understand that there is a countrywide need for an increase in suitable first time buyer houses (my opinion on this could stem another debate) however, the Aireborough Neighbourhood is NOT the place to build such houses. My reasons are as follows:-

- 1) The average price for houses in this area is between £200,000 - £250,000 - NOT affordable to the majority of first time buyers
- 2) The current congestion levels on the A65 and the sounding roads are really bad - these will increase following the development currently underway in Horsforth (just off the A65). If this were to increase further the roads just would not cope.
- 3) The local schools are already full to the brim. First time buyers = young families - Where and how are these children going to go to school?
- 4) Closure of Otley Police Station - surely increase in population = increase in crime - has this really been thought through!
- 5) Closure of Rawdon Fire Station - do I really need to outline my concern here?
- 6) The proposed land intended to be built on is GREENBELT LAND not BROWN.
- 7) The loss of rural land, loss of beautiful views, loss of wildlife and their homes.
- 8) Reduction in value to surrounding properties.

I have to ask the question WHY is this even being considered? This is GREENBELT LAND and according to a statement in my local paper this week Nick Boles Planning Minister stated "greenbelt can only be built on in exceptional circumstances". Well these are definitely NOT exceptional circumstances. Having looked into this quite deeply, I have read that in Leeds alone there is still sufficient BROWNBELT LAND available for a further 20,000 houses to be built. So WHY are we even having this debate doesn't BROWNBELT override GREENBELT when you are looking for somewhere to build?

The ease on the build itself should not even come into it. We all know that it is far easier and cheaper to dig a hole in a green field rather than knock down an existing building, clear away the rubbish etc before digging the hole BUT this is the developers problem. They are in it to make as much money as possible and once the job is done they won't care and we will be left with the consequences.

Doesn't the area average house value have to be considered if you are intending to build a specific type of house (or is this really not the case?). Doesn't current and increase in capacity need to be looked at and, whether the area and its existing services can sustain the increase.

Greg Mulholland also stated in my local paper in reply to Mr Boles' comment that it was good news the minister had made it absolutely clear that development on GREENBELT can only happen in exceptional circumstances. I urge you now as MPs to stick to your word - these are NOT exceptional circumstances!!!!

I would finally like to mention that, the news of this intended building has been kept exceptionally quiet and almost secretive. How on earth do you expect people to lodge objections by 29th July when the majority of the areas population are totally unaware of what is going on.

My father who lives just off the A65 has spent a great deal of time this week knocking on peoples doors and letting them know the intentions. 95% of those he spoke to had no idea at all.

So please, when your decision is made DO NOT think the lack of response means people are in favour - It actually means they were unaware.

You would have thought, if the council are as they say short of money (which I can well believe) they would prioritise communications they send - Party in the Park or Proposed Building

Developments - which is the most important??????

Sarah Lewis  
Rawdon

# General Comments

**Name:** Sarah Lewis

**Representor No:** PRS06276

Representation ID: REP07199      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing to officially lodge my objection for the proposed house building planned for the Aireborough district of Leeds.

According to official council documents it is proposed 320 new houses are to be built within a square mile radius of the JCT roundabout (A65) along with a further 350 houses on the fields surrounding the Warm Lane area (just off the A65).

I completely understand that there is a countrywide need for an increase in suitable first time buyer houses (my opinion on this could stem another debate) however, the Aireborough Neighbourhood is NOT the place to build such houses. My reasons are as follows:-

- 1) The average price for houses in this area is between £200,000 - £250,000 - NOT affordable to the majority of first time buyers
- 2) The current congestion levels on the A65 and the sounding roads are really bad - these will increase following the development currently underway in Horsforth (just off the A65). If this were to increase further the roads just would not cope.
- 3) The local schools are already full to the brim. First time buyers = young families - Where and how are these children going to go to school?
- 4) Closure of Otley Police Station - surely increase in population = increase in crime - has this really been thought through!
- 5) Closure of Rawdon Fire Station - do I really need to outline my concern here?
- 6) The proposed land intended to be built on is GREENBELT LAND not BROWN.
- 7) The loss of rural land, loss of beautiful views, loss of wildlife and their homes.
- 8) Reduction in value to surrounding properties.

I have to ask the question WHY is this even being considered? This is GREENBELT LAND and according to a statement in my local paper this week Nick Boles Planning Minister stated "greenbelt can only be built on in exceptional circumstances". Well these are definitely NOT exceptional circumstances. Having looked into this quite deeply, I have read that in Leeds alone there is still sufficient BROWNBELT LAND available for a further 20,000 houses to be built. So WHY are we even having this debate doesn't BROWNBELT override GREENBELT when you are looking for somewhere to build?

The ease on the build itself should not even come into it. We all know that it is far easier and cheaper to dig a hole in a green field rather than knock down an existing building, clear away the rubbish etc before digging the hole BUT this is the developers problem. They are in it to make as much money as possible and once the job is done they won't care and we will be left with the consequences.

Doesn't the area average house value have to be considered if you are intending to build a specific type of house (or is this really not the case?). Doesn't current and increase in capacity need to be looked at and, whether the area and its existing services can sustain the increase.

Greg Mulholland also stated in my local paper in reply to Mr Boles' comment that it was good news the minister had made it absolutely clear that development on GREENBELT can only happen in exceptional circumstances. I urge you now as MPs to stick to your word - these are NOT exceptional circumstances!!!!

I would finally like to mention that, the news of this intended building has been kept exceptionally quiet and almost secretive. How on earth do you expect people to lodge objections by 29th July when the majority of the areas population are totally unaware of what is going on.

My father who lives just off the A65 has spent a great deal of time this week knocking on peoples doors and letting them know the intentions. 95% of those he spoke to had no idea at all.

So please, when your decision is made DO NOT think the lack of response means people are in favour - It actually means they were unaware.

You would have thought, if the council are as they say short of money (which I can well believe) they would prioritise communications they send - Party in the Park or Proposed Building Developments - which is the most important?????

**Name:** Kate Parsonage

**Representor No:** PRS06278

Representation ID: REP07202      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I and my family strongly object to the plans for the proposed building on greenbelt land in the Aireborough area. Rawdon and Yeadon will be destroyed and the infrastructure will not be able to cope.

Representation ID: REP07614      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Barry Slater**

**Representor No: PRS06281**

Representation ID: REP07205      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I have just recently found out that Leeds City Council plan to allow 2300 new houses to be built in the Aireborough area over the next 15 years which involves building on Green Fields.

I would like to register my objection against Leeds City Council's plan.

The A65 in this area is badly congested.

The fire station on Green Lane is to be eventually closed.

We will lose our greenfield landscape.

These are just a few of my concerns.

I am also disconcerted that there has been no public notification by Leeds City Council to inform local residents of the above intentions. I would certainly appreciate the appropriate literature that the Council should provide to local residents so that I can ascertain exactly what Leeds City Council's plans are.

---

**Name: James B Bain**

**Representor No: PRS06282**

Representation ID: REP07206      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

For the last twenty years house building as been going on in the lofthouse area practically non-stop on every piece of land available, the pleasant, peaceful, clean, lovely little village we once knew is no longer recognizable, lofthouse has seen more than its share of development recently no one can argue with that, to build another two hundred and thirty four houses would be the final nail in the coffin, I feel we are now at the point of no return for lofthouse,. The amount of flats that have been built, in the area over the last few years have caused a constant stream of people renting properties and moving on every six or twelve months having no commitment to the well being of the neighbourhood or the community, .

To high light just a few problems that are continually becoming worse due to the constant development in the area, which building another extremely large housing project would only exaggerate,. The amount of pressure this would put on already over stretched local services to work efficiently,. The amount of rubbish and litter that is every where on the paths ,the grass verges, in the hedge bottoms, bins over flowing, that the council don,t seem to be able to keep up with as it is,. At peak periods on a morning, travelling to-wards leeds, the traffic is now queuing from the traffic lights at robin hood all the way back past longthorpe lane, To book a non emergency appointment at the doctors in rothwell is at least a months waiting time,. The local primary schools are already over crowded , and parents actually living in lofthouse are unable to get their children in the school of their choice,. I hope common sense will prevail, and the people responsible for this decision will show some interest and understanding for the area,.

---

**Name: Andrew Steer**

**Representor No: PRS06284**

Representation ID: REP07243      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

To: Leeds City Council

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

Signed by 407 people:

Representation ID: REP08021      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

Representation ID: REP08023      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

Representation ID: REP08025      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

Representation ID: REP08029      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Louise Walker

**Representor No:** PRS06285

Representation ID: REP07210

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I write, as part of the public consultation in respect of the Site Allocations Plan, to inform you of my views of the Council's designation of the above sites.

I am primarily concerned with the increase in traffic and the strain on public services as a result of the proposed site allocations and outline my thoughts below:

**1. Traffic**

We have seen recent housing developments in Adel on Adel Lane/ Church Lane in particular. The current proposals anticipate the potential for another 488 dwellings (across sites 1033, 1299A and 2130), which could all be given access to Adel Lane/ Church Lane. This road(s) is really a small rural, leading into a residential road, yet it is already used as a rat run by commuters seeking to avoid the congested A660.

Given this is a residential area, residents like to walk along this road to visit locals shops and schools, but it can be a very unpleasant experience. Cars race down this road and in many areas the path is very narrow. I do not feel that this is a safe environment for my children and so I am often dissuaded from walking with them along it.

Building more houses along this road will only add to the traffic, particularly as the houses likely to be built are large 4/5 bedroom houses, with at least 2 cars per house.

**2. Amenities, especially schools**

As already stated above, I feel it is likely that the new housing proposed for Adel is likely to consist of large 4/5 bedroom detached housing. These houses are therefore likely to contain at least 2 children per dwelling. This suggests over 1,000 new children in Adel. Whilst some of these will undoubtedly be of senior school age, the two primary schools within Adel are both over-subscribed and indeed one has a very limited catchment area.

Whilst local schools may therefore be within walking distance of the proposed dwellings, there is by no means any significant capacity for an increase in local children. Children will therefore be required to attend other schools, which will require travel by car, thereby adding to car journey frequency. Those that walk will face even busier roads which are already dangerous to cross, as a result of volume and speed of traffic.

In addition, Adel is very poorly provided for in terms of children's playgrounds etc (indeed, there are none) and so the increased number of children will need to travel by car to attend other playgrounds in North Leeds.

These additional car journeys cannot be in line with LCC's stated environmental policies and desires.

**3. Look and feel of the Adel area**

Adel is a desirable area as a result of its green space and leafy roads, along with the sense of access to the countryside at the end of Church Lane, next to Adel Church. Further development along this road, particularly close to Adel Church, will further diminish this sense and feel, and extend further the urban sprawl of Leeds. This will undoubtedly have a negative impact on residents' wellbeing, which I feel certain is a key consideration when considering future housing developments.

---

**Name:** R Smith

**Representor No:** PRS06286

Representation ID: REP07208

Question Ref: H4

Housing

The development of housing could take place on the land off Ridge Road and close to Peckfield Bar Roundabout, referred to as Site 1232.

This land would accommodate the required 3500 additional houses, with land spare. The reasons why we believe this site is more appropriate are:

- access to this site can be from Ridge Road (i.e. the road running between Peckfield Bar Roundabout and Junction 47 of the M1/A1 link road), which in turn provides direct access to the main transport links without driving traffic through Garforth itself;

- there would be no impact on existing drainage as a new infrastructure would be implemented as part of the development;

- given proximity is a key admissions criteria for schools, this location would mean it unlikely that households in the new settlement would take precedence over families living in the main Garforth village;

- Ridge Road / Selby Road will create a new natural boundary; and

- any extra retail / healthcare provision proven to be needed could be accommodated in the spare land with the up side of this being it could service Micklefield which has very limited provision.

Representation ID: REP07208

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We are writing this letter to show our concerns with regard to the Strategic Housing Land Allocation Consultation affecting the Outer South East of Leeds. As residents in Garforth we are concerned about the amount of housing and change identified in the local area.

We find it astounding that Garforth is being considered for such large scale developments. We have in the last six months been rejected for an outbuilding within our back garden as the roof was one metre above permitted development. The main reason for the rejection was the effect to the neighbouring surroundings. How can such large scale changes be considered when they will have such a detrimental effect on the neighbouring surroundings?

# General Comments

---

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

**Representor No: PRS06287**

Representation ID: REP07211      Question Ref: H10

Housing

In response to your Question H10, we do consider that there are 'other more suitable sites not shown on the plan that should be considered as a future housing allocation'. We therefore object to the Plan as drafted, given a full and proper assessment of all site options has not been completed in this sub-area.

The land shown on the attached plan adjacent to the PAS site at Oulton is eminently suited to a sympathetic urban extension incorporating open space and a robust landscape framework. In terms of your own criteria the following assertions are made:

- The site is sustainable and a range of local facilities and amenities are within a reasonable walking and cycling distance;
- Whilst not brownfield it is clear that a range of green belt sites need to be released to meet the target and local needs;
- High quality design can be achieved and we are happy to discuss agreeing a code;
- This site can be delivered quickly alongside the PAS site;
- There are no designated open spaces or other designations affected but our landholdings do offer the potential to contribute to the green infrastructure / biodiversity of the locality and to enhance playing field provision;
- The site is not at risk of flooding and SUDS solutions can be explored; and
- In terms of green belt the release of this site would not prejudice the overall purposes and functions, nor openness, being a logical rounding off that does not cause coalescence or merge settlements. We would be happy to discuss the site and specifically a landscape appraisal of the site in depth should you have concerns in this regard.

Plan included in full representation.

Representation ID: REP07510      Question Ref: H1

Housing

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: REP07510      Question Ref: H10

Housing

In response to your Question H10, we do consider that there are 'other more suitable sites not shown on the plan that should be considered as a future housing allocation'. We therefore object to the Plan as drafted, given a full and proper assessment of all site options has not been completed in this sub-area.

The land shown on the attached plan adjacent to the PAS site at Oulton is eminently suited to a sympathetic urban extension incorporating open space and a robust landscape framework. In terms of your own criteria the following assertions are made:

- The site is sustainable and a range of local facilities and amenities are within a reasonable walking and cycling distance;
- Whilst not brownfield it is clear that a range of green belt sites need to be released to meet the target and local needs;
- High quality design can be achieved and we are happy to discuss agreeing a code;
- This site can be delivered quickly alongside the PAS site;
- There are no designated open spaces or other designations affected but our landholdings do offer the potential to contribute to the green infrastructure / biodiversity of the locality and to enhance playing field provision;
- The site is not at risk of flooding and SUDS solutions can be explored; and
- In terms of green belt the release of this site would not prejudice the overall purposes and functions, nor openness, being a logical rounding off that does not cause coalescence or merge settlements.

See representation for the site plan.

---

**Name: Graham Crowther**

**Representor No: PRS06299**

Representation ID: REP07226      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am registering my objection to some of the sites in nether yeaddon on the site allocation plan .the access to these areas would affect the already severely congested A65 and apperley lane.In addition the local schools would be greatly overloaded.filling in every bit of greenfield in the area does not seem a very considered approach

# General Comments

---

**Name: Norma Sheldon**

**Representor No: PRS06303**

Representation ID: REP07231      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I was very dismayed to learn that LCC are planning to build new homes in Aireborough and are currently considering further development in our area.

I live on Mawcroft Mews just off the JCT roundabout and can assure you that the roads here cannot absorb further traffic. The roads are always fairly busy particularly the A65, but at peak times the roads are often close to gridlock, queues blocking the roundabout causing pollution, noise and making difficult to get anywhere.

We have already had a big increase in traffic because of all the commercial development in this area and to add large swathes of new housing would just tip us over the edge.

I was also very upset and angry to learn that the suggested sites include the green fields around Warm Lane (it is a lane) and opposite Little London. This is a truly appalling prospect. These areas have always been protected as they are within the green belt. How can they suddenly be suitable for development.

I appreciate that housing needs to be provided and will inevitably increase traffic wherever it is situated. But small developments should be the order of the day so as not to put too much strain on local services or affect people so dramatically.

Also development should only take place on brownfield sites. When I go down to Leeds on the train I pass the site where Kirkstall Forge used to be, still undeveloped. This would be an ideal site for building houses and I'm sure there are several other similar places across Leeds. Why choose green sites?

Please show some consideration and care to people who already live in Aireborough and think about our quality of life when you make decisions.

---

**Name: G Martin**

**Representor No: PRS06305**

Representation ID: REP07233      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

With regard to the recent consultation exercise for new housing within Aireborough, I do not believe that greenbelt sites should be used for any new housing developments whatsoever.

This area (Rawdon/Yeadon/Guiseley/Menston) has seen so many housing developments in the past years. Every mill and factory in the immediate vicinity has been developed for housing with the exception of the two Guiseley Retail Parks. Highroyds Hospital, Menston was sold in 2003 and has been an ongoing development for several years; Netherfield Road, Guiseley now has two developments being built and Naylor Jennings on Green Lane, Yeadon has been approved for housing development. There is also a large development about to begin in the village of Menston.

All this development but the infrastructure is still as it was 35 years ago! The roads cannot cope with all the traffic at present, the primary schools are over subscribed. The A65 is at a standstill every weekday morning and evening which will become a bigger nightmare once all the ongoing developments are complete. Queensway in Yeadon has become a rat run due to congestion on the A65 causing problems and holdups.

You inform us that you need to find another approx 1500 houses between now and 2028. Why not bring some of the abandoned/unoccupied housing back into use? I gather from a television programme this week that there are 15,000 such properties in West Yorkshire. Surely between 2013 and 2028 more brownfield sites will become available to be utilised for housing if it is still necessary. Somewhere in Whitehall someone has decided what numbers apply where, without any local knowledge or connection to the area.

Greenbelt land should be held as precious, along with the trees and wildlife that it sustains. Once it is lost it can never be brought back and is gone forever.

---

**Name: David Wilkinson**

**Representor No: PRS06306**

Representation ID: REP07236      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I would like to register my concern and objection to the proposal to build a large number of new houses in the Nether Yeadon area of Leeds. This area has already see a large number of new houses built over recent years, this coupled with the vast number of new houses in the Guiseley and Menston areas has put a great strain in the local road network. The A65 is virtually grid locked for four hours every day and is at best a crawl from Leeds centre right out to Menston and beyond. To add more traffic to this and other local roads will make life unbearable.

I know that the local primary school, Rawdon Littlemoor, is full and I suspect the others in the area are too. I wonder if the local doctors and dentists will be able to cope with such an increase in the local population.

If this proposal is to go ahead it will completely alter the nature of the area.



## General Comments

---

**Name: John And Betty Grunwell**

**Representor No: PRS06310**

Representation ID: REP07248      Question Ref: H12

Housing

QUESTION H12

No sites are suitable for travellers, and there is no need given the proposed extension of the site at Cottingley Springs which can more than accommodate the anticipated need.

---

**Name: Arlene Davies**

**Representor No: PRS06319**

Representation ID: REP07253      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

You are suppose to be planners!!! !You have to take into account the overcrowded roads, schools etc. It is already been publicly shown that roads in this Region are the busiest in the country. How many hours extra do you think people will be queuing daily. Just in case you don't know A65 also leads to the Lakes, Ilkley - You can't have thought about this as I'm sure you'd realise your plan is a non-starter.

# General Comments

**Name: Ashdale Land And Property Company**

**Representor No: PRS06324**

Representation ID: REP07267      Question Ref: H4

Housing

Sites 1004, 1013, 1149, 1165, 1232, 2091, 2131, 2156, 2157A, 1244, 3109A, 1226, 3110

1004

The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:

- ☐ The site currently comprises N1 green space, National policy requires an assessment to be made regarding the reallocation of such land, with no assessment this cannot be removed.
- ☐ The site is a Local Nature Area, other sites exist without these constraints which are considered more appropriate.

1013

The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:

- ☐ Development of the site would start to merge the two settlements and contributes to the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.
- ☐ The site has no access, without this coming forward it would be inappropriate to allocate a site with no access.

1149

The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:

- ☐ The Site is a PAS site and is considered appropriate for allocation, however it is considered that the proposed delivery rates are too high given the need for future applications, discharge of conditions and delivery over the plan period.

1165

The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:

- ☐ The site is blighted by HS2 and cannot be proven as deliverable. Sites with no constraints from HS2 should be considered in advance of this.
- ☐ There is no access as the site has no road frontage.

1232

The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:

- ☐ The whole site would impact upon the purposes of the green belt by merging Garforth with Micklefield.
- ☐ Although in principle part of the site could come forward, the whole site would be inappropriate for the reason above, the level of housing is over and above the 3500 maximum for Garforth and only 600 could come through the plan period due to deliverability and build out rates.

2091

The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:

- ☐ Development of the site will lead to the loss of a playing pitch

2131

The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:

- ☐ The site is identified in the UDP as an area of protected search (PAS). However, the site is severely constrained by substantial mature tree planting.

2156

The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:

- ☐ The site is due to accommodate the new high speed rail track and this in itself would prevent development
- ☐ The highways department have expressed concerns relating to the capacity and suitability of the local highway network

2157A

The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:

- ☐ No strong defensible boundary so could potentially result in further urban sprawl
- ☐ Would reduce the strategic gap between Micklefield and Garforth resulting the merging of the two settlements.

1244

The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:

- ☐ The site has clear access issues, with no direct access.

The site is not deliverable as it needs to rely on other sites.

3109A

The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:

- ☐ As noted by the council, there are currently no defensible boundaries to north and south which could result in pressure for the release of further land.
- ☐ Highways have expressed concerns regarding the proposed access and local road infrastructure

1226

The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:

- ☐ The site is blighted by HS2 and cannot be proven as deliverable. Sites with no constraints from HS2 should be considered in advance of this.

# General Comments

**Name:** Ashdale Land And Property Company  
**Representor No:** PRS06324

3110

The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:  
☐ As identified by the councils highways department, the site has no direct access.

Having assessed the majority of amber sites within the Outer South East sub-area it is clear that several of these sites should be re-classified as red as they are constrained or are not achievable at the present time. Unless it can be demonstrated that these matters can be addressed the sites should not be considered as future allocations for residential development.

In conclusion, the following amber sites have deliverability issues and have not been correctly categorised.

[See table as submitted in the representation for full details]

The removal of the above sites from the amber yield gives a total capacity of 2,488. When this is combined with the revised green capacity of 908 it provides a total of 3,396 and in order to meet the residual requirement of 3,534, it means that there is a requirement of 138 units from red sites.

See also representation submitted for full details

Representation ID: REP07267      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

**The Sites**  
The total yield from green sites within the sub-area is 1121, whilst the yield from amber sites is 11,400 which gives a total capacity from green and amber sites of 12,521 which exceeds the residual requirement of 3,534.

The Council states that not all green and amber sites will therefore be required to meet the residual requirement within the District. However, there are a host of green and amber sites that have potential delivery issues that need to be addressed and there is no guarantee that they will come forward.

Having assessed the site allocations document it is considered that there are a number of overarching issues that need to be addressed when the next draft is published. These are as follows:

- ☐ The overall housing target for the District is too low;
- ☐ The Council should not include existing consents as proposed allocations;
- ☐ The developable area of a site is generally less than the gross site area and a 10% discount should be applied to the yield of all sites; and
- ☐ Some green and amber sites have potential deliverability issues and have been identified in the wrong category.

## Site Allocations DPD

This chapter identifies some of the delivery issues on the Councils sites demonstrating the need for the inclusion of more sites to meet the requirement of 3,534 new homes and demonstrates the suitability of Ashdale's Sites to contribute to the clear shortfall.

## Introduction

Having assessed the sites within the Outer South East market area it is clear that a significant number of sites have potential delivery issues and are not considered to be deliverable sites.

As stated at paragraph 3.1 above the Council is of the opinion that the residual requirement of 3,534 for the market area can be achieved with green and amber sites and that not all of those identified will be required. Our assessment provides a very different conclusion, which is outlined in table 4.1 below:

Table 4.1 – Comparison of Site Allocation DPD and our assessment Site Allocation DPD Assessment Our Assessment

Green Sites
1121
908
Amber Sites
11,400
2,488
Red Sites
0
138
Total
12,521
3,534

Table 4.1 indicates that the local planning authority is of the opinion that the residual requirement can be achieved without the requirement for any red sites to come forward. However, following our assessment of the sites it is clear that a significant proportion of the amber sites are not deliverable and in order to meet the housing needs of the District, a number of red sites will need to be brought forward.

This assessment utilises an assessment of the overall sub market area and its requirements. The key diagram included within the Core Strategy provides housing requirements for a number of settlements, including our Clients land in Micklefield. Micklefield is identified as needing between 500-1000 new homes during the plan period. In considering this the additional units identified in our table below should be removed from the least sustainable settlements which do not have an individual target. As will be demonstrated in these representations our Client's land at Micklefield is required in order to deliver the overall total of homes required in the Outer South East area and also to deliver up to 1000 new homes in Micklefield.

See also representation submitted for full details.

# General Comments

Name: G E Hall

Representor No: PRS06326

Representation ID: REP07272 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Notes and matters requiring the attention of the Planning Authority

- 1.This response is qualified due to the incomplete information given in the documentation provided by Leeds City Council. Specifically detail on Land uses included in Volumes 1 and 2 of the consultation document is incomplete,
- 2.The omission of detail for potentially NEW Protected Area of Search Sites is omitted and could affect the support or opposition to the classification of sites suggested by Leeds City Council. Attention must be given to the emerging local development framework Spatial policy 10 Greenbelt and the "creation of New Protected Areas of Search. Such a departure would be contrary to legal precedents , these being Carpets of Worth and Copas High Court judgements
- 3.The emerging ldf appears to be departing from the policy on which Green Belt which guidance advises should be enduring unless exceptional circumstances prove otherwise. Green Belt Boundaries should only be changed at the time the plan is developed and MUST be enduring for the foreseeable future
- 4.The Green Space provision , existing and future should be directly proportionate to the village locations affected by development therefore the data provided on a Leeds City Council Ward basis is not sufficiently "fine - tuned" to allow respondents to accurately reflect the needs of their community
- 5.Table 6.3.2 advises that certain sites have been "sieved out". The reason given is "Not within the settlement hierarchy" although no further explanation is provided. No responses are being sought in relation to these sites (a) Yet the sites are within Parish Boundary Areas they are a part of the hierarchy (b) Where Neighbourhood Development Plans are being prepared, should it therefore be assumed that the current use of the sieved out sites are acceptable or other uses might be preferred or provide more efficient use of Land?
- 6.The majority of sites identified by the City Council through the Strategic Land Housing Availability Assessment were noted as Green Belt. SHLAA Government Guidance advises that Council's preparing development plans are under an obligation to overcome constraints. The criteria for maintaining Green belt is set out in the National Planning Policy. Recent Ministerial announcements and inquiries held by the planning inspectorate into the soundness of emerging development plans give cause for concern that National Policy cannot be relied on – Such Statements are subject to Lawful challenge ( see note 2 above)
- 7.Any sites which are subject to this consultation shall have regard to Current saved policies of the 2006 review of the Unitary Development plan (2001-2016) and emerging policy core strategy of the Leeds local development framework, when adopted, to ensure that released sites which come forward with a formal planning application meets the planning policy criteria. Failure to do so would not only be a departure from plan policy but also mean that the law in the form of section 54A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 1991 is breached. This states "determining planning proposals must be made in accordance with the plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Accordingly the policy to protect the character and Identity of Community Hierarchy set out in Table 1 of the Core Strategy, Sustainability of development and accessibility criteria identified in the extant and emerging development plans require to be satisfied.
- 8.In assessing site allocations for housing and other land uses , consistency with Village design statements adopted by the Local Planning Authority, Parish Councils and local communities is essential because a VDS is recognised as being a material planning consideration. Many emerging Neighbourhood development plans albeit not yet tested or adopted have been the subject of extensive community involvement should be seen as informing the "Site Allocations" process and form a part of this consultation
- 9.I strongly disagree with the Councils perception of Housing Characteristic Areas which are inconsistent with Parish Boundaries. The significant consequences which arise therefrom are incompatible both in terms of Localism and Neighbourhood Planning . I propose to raise this at inquiry as a Localism Act issue which has relevance to the Development Plan and Site allocations making process.

# General Comments

Name: G E Hall

Representor No: PRS06326

Representation ID: REP07273 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Notes and matters requiring the attention of the Planning Authority

- 1.This response is qualified due to the incomplete information given in the documentation provided by Leeds City Council. Specifically detail on Land uses included in Volumes 1 and 2 of the consultation document is incomplete,
- 2.The omission of detail for potentially NEW Protected Area of Search Sites is omitted and could affect the support or opposition to the classification of sites suggested by Leeds City Council. Attention must be given to the emerging local development framework Spatial policy 10 Greenbelt and the "creation of New Protected Areas of Search. Such a departure would be contrary to legal precedents, these being Carports of Worth and Copas High Court judgements
- 3.The emerging Ldf appears to be departing from the policy on which Green Belt which guidance advises should be enduring unless exceptional circumstances prove otherwise. Green Belt Boundaries should only be changed at the time the plan is developed and MUST be enduring for the foreseeable future
- 4.The Green Space provision, existing and future should be directly proportionate to the village locations affected by development therefore the data provided on a Leeds City Council Ward basis is not sufficiently "fine - tuned" to allow respondents to accurately reflect the needs of their community
- 5.Table 6.3.2 advises that certain sites have been "sieved out". The reason given is "Not within the settlement hierarchy" although no further explanation is provided. No responses are being sought in relation to these sites (a) Yet the sites are within Parish Boundary Areas they are a part of the hierarchy (b) Where Neighbourhood Development Plans are being prepared, should it therefore be assumed that the current use of the sieved out sites are acceptable or other uses might be preferred or provide more efficient use of Land?
- 6.The majority of sites identified by the City Council through the Strategic Land Housing Availability Assessment were noted as Green Belt. SHLAA Government Guidance advises that Council's preparing development plans are under an obligation to overcome constraints. The criteria for maintaining Green belt is set out in the National Planning Policy. Recent Ministerial announcements and inquiries held by the planning inspectorate into the soundness of emerging development plans give cause for concern that National Policy cannot be relied on – Such Statements are subject to Lawful challenge ( see note 2 above)
- 7.Any sites which are subject to this consultation shall have regard to Current saved policies of the 2006 review of the Unitary Development plan (2001-2016) and emerging policy core strategy of the Leeds local development framework, when adopted, to ensure that released sites which come forward with a formal planning application meets the planning policy criteria. Failure to do so would not only be a departure from plan policy but also mean that the law in the form of section 54A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 1991 is breached. This states "determining planning proposals must be made in accordance with the plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Accordingly the policy to protect the character and Identity of Community Hierarchy set out in Table 1 of the Core Strategy, Sustainability of development and accessibility criteria identified in the extant and emerging development plans require to be satisfied.
- 8.In assessing site allocations for housing and other land uses, consistency with Village design statements adopted by the Local Planning Authority, Parish Councils and local communities is essential because a VDS is recognised as being a material planning consideration. Many emerging Neighbourhood development plans albeit not yet tested or adopted have been the subject of extensive community involvement should be seen as informing the "Site Allocations" process and form a part of this consultation
- 9.I strongly disagree with the Councils perception of Housing Characteristic Areas which are inconsistent with Parish Boundaries. The significant consequences which arise therefrom are incompatible both in terms of Localism and Neighbourhood Planning. I propose to raise this at inquiry as a Localism Act issue which has relevance to the Development Plan and Site allocations making process.

Representation ID: REP07291 Question Ref: G5

Greenspace

Responses to questions: G4; G5 and G6.

It is agreed that Section 106 money or land exchange agreement should be provided to meet the need adequate green space of all types where deficiency arises from new development. Any new provision should meet the accessibility criteria taking account of all age groups and mobility constraints which may be determined by the DDA.  
In the Outer North East Area poor quality sites or the responsibility for upgrading of existing facilities identified in Neighbourhood Development Plans should be the responsibility of Parish Councils who can utilise funding arising from the "community infrastructure levy" to improve those provisions which fall below the required standard.

Representation ID: REP07291 Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Responses to questions: G4; G5 and G6.

It is agreed that Section 106 money or land exchange agreement should be provided to meet the need adequate green space of all types where deficiency arises from new development. Any new provision should meet the accessibility criteria taking account of all age groups and mobility constraints which may be determined by the DDA.  
In the Outer North East Area poor quality sites or the responsibility for upgrading of existing facilities identified in Neighbourhood Development Plans should be the responsibility of Parish Councils who can utilise funding arising from the "community infrastructure levy" to improve those provisions which fall below the required standard.

Representation ID: REP07291 Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Green Space - Issues and Options (Outer North East)

Parks- Gardens - Outdoor Sports – Amenity - Children and Young People – Allotments - Natural

My main concern in responding to the questions set out in this section is that the evidence provided is for Leeds City Council wards

Note Table 6.5.1. Page 31 volume 2 of Site Allocations Brochure

It would appear that the Accessibility Standards set out in the Core Strategy have not been" fully "considered as a part of this study. The need to have readily available and easy read information from the 2011 "Open Space Audit" might provide clarify G10 and paragraph 6.5.10 of the Consultation document. I question how many respondents will make the effort to obtain the Audit/Study thereby illustrating an ability to provide any answer with authority rather than perception. I disagree that Scholes has an acceptable accessibility provision given the poor transport services, and time necessary changing service provision/providers/ walking distances or mobility issues to access key leisure facilities.

Many adopted local village design statements or those waiting approval by Leeds City Council could provide some of the answers the council are seeking.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Janet Legg**

**Representor No: PRS06330**

Representation ID: REP07284      Question Ref: H11

Housing

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

Representation ID: REP07284      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.

---

**Name: Taylor Wimpey And Ashdale Land & Property**

**Representor No: PRS06331**

Representation ID: REP07286      Question Ref: H11

Housing

We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations.

Representation ID: REP07286      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.

# General Comments

**Name: David Ingham**

**Representor No: PRS06335**

Representation ID: REP07290      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Comments of the WARD organisation are as follows:

Protecting Green Belt

The WARD organisation is concerned that so much green belt appears to have been placed in this site allocations exercise and too much brownfield land has been ignored. Approximately 60% of the sites across the city (whatever their colour grading) appears to be drawn from greenbelt land and this goes directly against government policy outlined in para 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework:

“Protecting Green Belt Land

The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.”

Para 80 follows with:

“Green Belt serves five purposes:

- 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.”

Para 87 goes on to state:

“As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.”

And finally Para 89 is quite clear:

“A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- Buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- Provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- The extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- Limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or
- Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.”

The proposals outlined in the entire Leeds City Site Allocations Programme are in direct contravention of the above NPPF guidelines on protecting greenbelt land. As such, the WARD organisation strongly objects to the inclusion of so much greenbelt land in the Site Allocations Plan. Naturally we understand that inclusion in the SHLAA does not necessarily mean that all the sites will be developed but, given the composition of the SHLAA Group and the current trend for developers to claim that brownfield sites are non-deliverable it comes as no surprise to find so much greenbelt included in the proposals. This, of course, readily identifies land likely to produce the greatest profits for developers and under current planning legislation, makes the greenfield sites extremely attractive targets.

Public perception of the SHLAA partnership is such that house builders and local property agents are seen as paying more attention to profit margins. The argument that house builders and local property agents provide expertise and knowledge to help the SHLAA take a view on the deliverability of sites and how market conditions may affect economic viability only strengthens this public perception. The current SHLAA group comprising:

Leeds City Councillor (Chair)

LCC Planning Officer  
LCC Planning Officer  
LCC Planning Officer

Community representative  
Campaign for Protection of Rural England representative

Renew representative  
Homes and Communities Agency representative  
Leeds Property Forum representative  
Leeds City Region representative

Barratt David Wilson Homes representative  
Persimmon Homes representative  
Ben Bailey Homes representative

can hardly be said to be unbiased. There is little doubt that the house builder input has had an impact on sites selection evident in this Site

# General Comments

---

**Name:** David Ingham

**Representor No:** PRS06335

Allocations Plan. The SHLAA partnership needs drastic revision and a more open and transparent way of proceeding with its business.

Infrastructure Problems

Traffic Congestion

The Leeds City Council Site Allocations Plan and, indeed, the Core Strategy with its housing targets of 66,000 over the next 15 years which predicates the need for the identification of so many sites appears to pay little heed to the vast amount of evidence which clearly demonstrates lack of both transport and social infrastructure. A recent study (Tom Tom Congestion-Index for Europe 2013) shows that the Leeds/Bradford area is the 8th most congested conurbation in Europe and also the most congested in the UK – London ranks 10th. Public transport issues (see below) are responsible for the A65 and A660 being the two most heavily congested roads in Leeds and this is directly related to an increase in vehicle numbers on many minor roads (eg Burley Road) by 'rat running' car drivers.

Public Transport Issues

Public transport, at peak times, struggles to cope with commuters from dormitory areas such as Aireborough, as buses can take up to 50 minutes to reach the city centre from Menston and Guiseley and trains, at peak times, are jammed to capacity (standing room only) and commuters from places like Otley and Guiseley itself drive cars to Menston causing congestion and blocking village roads in their attempts to board trains and find a seat.

The parking at Guiseley railway station and in Guiseley generally is totally inadequate and this too forces drivers to commute further out to board trains. Any further plans to increase populations in these dormitory areas can only exacerbate these problems. There is an urgent need for these transport infrastructure problems to be addressed before any further development is even considered in areas such as Aireborough.

Social Infrastructure

Again, as evidenced by recent meetings in Guiseley, there are major problems associated with the availability of school places, doctors, dentists, recreational areas and other social requirements demanded by an increase in population due to new development.

Hospitals in Leeds are already over-stretched illustrated by the maternity situation where two hospitals were closed for admissions for about 100 days last year and expectant mothers were forced to travel to Bradford and other health authorities to give birth with consequent post natal care issues.

Schools are now very much over capacity and recent meetings concerning the expansion of two Guiseley infant and primary schools caused a furore from irate parents who demanded to know why there was land available to build 2,300 houses in Aireborough yet no land available upon which to build a new school. Education representatives stated quite clearly that for every 100 houses built there would be a demand for 25 primary school places and 10 secondary places. This equates (in Aireborough) to 575 primary school places and 230 secondary school places, when all the proposed 2,300 extra houses are built, clearly indicating the need for new schools and not extensions to old ones. Indeed, proposed extensions to all schools will cause further infrastructure problems by adding to existing traffic congestion and depriving our children of playing space when temporary classrooms are sited in their outdoor areas.

Patient lists for doctors and dentists, especially in the outer dormitory areas, are already over-subscribed and it is almost impossible to gain early appointments to these medical practitioners.

Drainage, sewerage, flooding, waste collection, again it appears that impact on these facilities has not been carefully considered. Existing sewerage and drainage infrastructure is currently not coping with the heavy rainfall we have experienced over the last few months. Most drains were constructed in Victorian times and are certainly not able to cope with extra demand due to excessive development.

These problems of transport and social infrastructure appear not to be addressed in the Leeds LDF Core Strategy and it would seem sensible that some careful thought should be afforded to having infrastructure improvements in place before any further large scale development is even considered.



# General Comments

---

**Name: David Ingham**

**Representor No: PRS06335**

Representation ID: REP07290      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

In the meantime, WARD would also urge LCC to concentrate on persuading house builders to complete the thousands of planning permissions already granted on sites where not a single brick has been laid. They should also concentrate on renovation of the 15,000 or so empty properties and consider ways of following NPPF policy of brownfield first.

Footnote: Please note all the above comments are evidence based as a result of responses to questionnaires issued to gather evidence for Neighbourhood Development Plans by the Aireborough Neighbourhood Forum and by Rawdon Parish Council. There was a consensus that infrastructure issues needed addressing before any further development takes place in Guiseley and Rawdon. There was common agreement that traffic and congestion issues and school places, doctors, dentists etc need addressing. Another common concern was the loss of greenspace and recreational opportunities on open ground. The following is a quote from the concluding paragraphs of Rawdon Parish Council's analysis of questionnaire responses:

"Other Overarching Comments

Within the survey work participants were asked to identify their three pre-requisites for any development to occur. Overwhelmingly these were to ensure traffic and transport related infrastructure was addressed, adequate school provision was available and that medical facilities had their capacity increased.

The Parish Council has observed a significant body of opinion that is opposed to any development within the parish until such time as the infrastructure issues are addressed.

The Parish Council has struggled to understand how some of the assessments have been carried out and conclusions reached. The Parish Council also has concerns about the impact that development of sites outside the parish boundary may have on congestion and use of facilities and resources within the parish. The Parish Council would be grateful for more detail on how conclusions are reached in future.

The Parish Council is aware that it will continue to collect valuable data and views from residents through the Neighbourhood Planning process and may discover other improvements and requirements may be necessary to support future development within and adjacent to the Parish."

Please note, the WARD organisation wishes to support and fully endorse the comments of Aireborough Civic Society relating to other sites in Aireborough.

---

**Name: Mark Mills**

**Representor No: PRS06341**

Representation ID: REP07302      Question Ref: H10

Housing

A site at Amberton Terrace (SHLAA reference 817) was assessed as part of the SHLAA process and was identified as suitable for housing in the short term. This is a brownfield site which has been made available through the clearance of housing and has always been intended for redevelopment for residential uses. However, this site is not included in the Site Allocation Plan Issues and Options document and falls between the Inner and North areas. The site should be included on the same basis as other cleared housing sites are in the East Leeds area and should be identified as green (site which has the greatest potential to be allocated for housing).

No site Plan supplied

Representation ID: REP07302      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

General Comments  
Belle and Middleton

A Neighbourhood Framework has been prepared for Belle Isle and Middleton which sets out development and investment opportunities across the area. Through this process a number of sites were identified which could be brought forward for new housing and other uses. The comments included in this response emerge from this work which considers the area in a holistic and comprehensive way.

Representation ID: REP07355      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Seacroft

Local residents and ward members have a desire to progress a neighbourhood plan for the Seacroft area which is currently characterised by a large number of cleared housing sites and swathes of open space, some of which is of a poor quality, disconnected and serving little purpose. An overarching view must be taken across the area to ensure that open space is effectively reduced and reconfigured and that the remaining greenspace is of high quality and relates well to new and existing housing areas. Areas such as the Wykebeck Valley corridor and the Rein are existing areas of greenspace which have seen recent investment and these facilities will need to play an ever important role as redevelopment begins to take place across Seacroft.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Alec & Zoe Main**

**Representor No: PRS06348**

Representation ID: REP07324      Question Ref: G1

Greenspace

Land between sites 935 and 160 - land behind Grove Park Care Home

Following helpful clarification from staff at Planning, we now understand that the area of land we referred to in this response is among those being considered for deletion from the list of sites with protected open green space status. The land in question lies behind Grove Park care home on Grove Lane, Leeds 6. Using Greenspace map 16 references, the land lies between 98A Grove Lane to the east, site 935 to the west, and site 160 (Woodhouse Ridge) to the south. We own the southern part of the land marked with a P, and would strongly press for the continuation of open green space status for all of it. Indeed, we bought our field expressly to protect it from development. The two fields which make up the site are an integral part of the green corridor and we want everything done that can be done to keep both fields green.

Some 15 years ago both these fields were the subject of significant, sustained and successful community action to defend them against inappropriate housing development. The action, which included a press campaign, lobbying of councillors and planning officers, and a silent vigil by local people of all ages, drew attention to the environmental diversity and amenity value to the whole community of this wildlife haven. A feature of the struggle was the need to be constantly vigilant: councilors and planning enforcement officers had to intervene on site twice when builders moved into these fields, which had been protected as part of the planning permission granted for the neighbouring land. Since that date the community has had a particular sense of attachment to their "bit of countryside in the town", with horses grazing in both fields, and foxes, kingfishers, grey herons frequently seen - and there's also the brown trout and rare British crayfish in the beck.

Largely as a result of the successful fight, the area has continued to be one in which permanent residents, parents and children feeding the horses, visitors, people new to the area, university and college students and staff, all congratulate themselves on having landed in such a "rural" environment within 2 miles of this northern city's centre. It is a rare resource in an area of high housing density, and must be preserved at all costs.

# General Comments

---

**Name: David Thomson**

**Representor No: PRS06352**

Representation ID: REP07333      Question Ref: General comment

Retail

In the Site allocations Plan Vol 2 Boston Spa has been classified as a Higher Order Local Centre yet under the Core Strategy it has been classified as a Smaller Settlement. There is NO space for enlargement of the centre and the level of services available are also inconsistent with a higher level centre. The Health Check by Colliers International has incorrectly assessed the facilities available, we only have one doctors surgery and one part time bank. There are no estate agencies. The car park in the centre is modest yet there is some time limited on street parking. Because of these issues and errors Boston Spa should be re classified as a Lower Order Local Centre.

Representation ID: REP07336      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

1. With an overall guide of 8% for the Outer North East Area Boston Spa already has extant planning consents for 207 additional houses which represents an 11% increase in dwellings over and above the existing provision. As a 'Smaller Settlement' the village should only be required to accept a lower level of increase so in effect should not have to have any further developments imposed upon it.

2. Boston Spa already has over stretched facilities in terms of primary education, greenspace, recreational facilities, medical facilities and poor public transport especially to the east of Bridge Road before the existing permissions for 207 houses are constructed. Additional development should not be permitted unless technical evidence is provided to identify sufficient capacity within the existing infrastructure and, where this is not the case, any shortfall identified must be provided for as part of the proposed development. These infrastructure improvements must be directly related to, and in scale with, the proposed development. Other than in exceptional circumstances where infrastructure gaps are identified and cannot be provided as part of the proposed development then such proposals should be refused permission. It is worth noting that there is existing approval for 140 new homes at Papyrus Works on the eastern edge of Boston Spa which will place further demand on infrastructure.

3. A village wide questionnaire has had a response rate of 38% and the overwhelming majority would not support development of over 50 homes in total over all sites. Respondents also strongly opposed any significant development on any individual site. Furthermore the consensus view was that new development should be limited to sites within the existing settlement boundary. It would be contrary to the aims of the Localism Act 2011 and the NPPF Guidance to ignore the views of the local stakeholders.

4. We understand and respect the overall housing requirement for Leeds ONE in the next 15 years and support and encourage the utilisation of the Thorp Arch Estate site and the University of Leeds, Headley Hall site 3391 in the next 5 – 10 years. In both cases the developments could provide independent sustainable communities with minimal adverse impacts on adjacent communities and facilities. In addition

5. We discourage the allocation of any Gypsy or other traveller's site in Boston Spa or the wider ONE area. We believe that such sites should be within or adjacent to main urban areas and on brown field sites close to existing services and facilities. In any event there is an existing site at Springs Lane.

In general we support the colour notation used in the Consultation document but caution the general acceptance of the Amber category by the following site specific comments. These are reinforced by a separate submission on Green Space where Leeds own assessment shows the severely limited facilities that we do have in the village when measured against Leeds Core Strategy proposals for the provision of such spaces.

---

**Name: McGregor's Brothers Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS06357**

Representation ID: REP07353      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

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

Answer: The McGregor's yard at Mill Lane East Ardsley provides an outstanding opportunity to improve the quality and access to open space provision in the locality, as outlined in the response to question H10 above [see REP07305].

# General Comments

---

**Name: Joanna Brooks**

**Representor No: PRS06365**

Representation ID: REP07356      Question Ref: H1

Housing

H1 The green sites identified are mostly green belt, which is a shame. They are largely the most suitable if considered against the other options.

Representation ID: REP07356      Question Ref: H7

Housing

Red Sites

H7 No

H8 I don't see why site 1148 is a red site as it has all the same issues as 3026 and 4043. The Ings area is also historic and the agreements used against developing site 1148 can all be used against Ings Lane as well.

H9 I think sites 3026, 4043, 1180A, 1311A and 2163A should all be red. The schools are already at capacity and controversial new plans for Guiseley to make two new primary schools have been strongly fought against by the majority of parents and local people. There is a need for a new school here and if all these housing allocations go ahead the situation will become dire but we are told there is no money to build a school.

Representation ID: REP07356      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

New housing - I understand the need for new houses but feel that areas need to be regenerated first and empty houses made fit for purpose before new ones are built. There are lots of areas around Leeds that should be made into desirable areas which are fully accessible to the city centre for work. The area of Aireborough is becoming grid locked. I moved here about 7 years ago because I needed to be near enough to work in Leeds. However, if I had known that the traffic would get worse so quickly and that it would get all of these housing allocations I would have thought twice. There are many places I would like to live but can't afford but I accept that and live within my means. I don't believe that beautiful areas should be crammed full of houses because there is a demand to live there cheaply. Putting all of these new houses on green fields in Aireborough will not only ruin what is currently a lovely place for the people who live here, but ruin it for all those who will move here in the future.

Representation ID: REP07377      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Quantity of greenspace - this cannot really be analysed on a grouped basis. Guiseley on paper has more greenspace / amenity than is required, yet in reality this is not the case. Nunroyd Park is in Yeadon and not accessible to Guiseley children / residents who live on the other side of the town. The central 'park' in Guiseley (Springfield) is very poor, with very limited play equipment and little landscaping. It does not really feel like a park as it has no fixed boundary and is more of a green area around Aireborough leisure centre car park. It is being slightly enlarged when Springfield mills is developed but needs a lot of work to make it feel like a park people can use. There is also the cricket pitch area and Guiseley AFC but this is run down and criss crossed by traffic. The playground is very poor and old and right next to the A65. A town of Guiseley's size should have a proper community area in which to meet - there are a number of poor quality areas none of which are well designed or very usable. There are deficiencies in outdoor sport areas and allotments. There is little for young people to do. The nearest skate park is Menston or Nunroyd park, both of which are too far away to go by many children in Guiseley unless accompanied by an adult due to traffic and dangerous roads. New greenspace/ outdoor play areas, should be provided in new developments, but not just tiny scraps, proper sites which have a sports hall / pavilion to provide a community base. Many of the green belt around Aireborough is inaccessible so provision of 'rural' footpaths around developments

# General Comments

---

**Name: Rachel Bentley**

**Representor No: PRS06370**

Representation ID: REP07374      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I do not agree that the sites identified as green are the most suitable – almost ALL the lime green and green sites are based around Wetherby – just too many for one Market Town and NOT just because of retail consideration. Country roads and parking are issues and the answer is not to concrete over our countryside.

In the plan the existing planning for housing in, around or serviced by Wetherby is already over 500 homes. The 'green' in or around Wetherby on the plan are as follows: [SEE TABLE IN ATTACHED DOC] Which totals 2846 including around 500 already permitted, then add in Spen Common Lane at 3000 and the total is 5846.

I am really unhappy that this will be agreed as on paper this solves the problem of the 5000 allocated to Outer North East and gives an additional 846 which could be taken from another area. This simply is not sustainable for the Wetherby area.

Spen Common Lane – not a good idea – it would be about 4 times the size of Boston Spa. Puts huge pressure on Bramham Cross Roads and the A64. ALL infrastructure (including junction upgrade to A1/A64) will be needed similar to a town the size of Wetherby – a huge environmental and social impact on this totally rural area. See below for further comment.

**FURTHER COMMENTS NOT ATTRIBUTED TO A QUESTION BUT PROVIDED TO THIS CONSULTATION PROCESS:**

- I feel that the percentage allocation for home building in each area seems arbitrary and needs further explanation. How is this based on need?

For instance in the Wetherby area, homes are on the market for a considerable time so that suggests no current shortage. In terms of future need unless a massive employment investment is made locally. This means that the rural area will end up being semi industrialised, or people moving in will all need a car for commuting to employment. So there will be no market for the planned 5000 plus homes unless Leeds City Council wants to create a situation of industrialisation for Wetherby plus additional car use of at least 7000 cars which will be extremely detrimental to the rural environment.

- The areas as set are arbitrary with Outer North East extending from Leeds ring road to Wetherby -with little similarity between villages well served for roads, buses, jobs, retail, schools and near driving for Leeds – such as Scholes and villages - compared with Wetherby and villages which apart from the A1/A64 access is under served and under funded with infrastructure and likely to cope poorly with any further development at all never mind the almost 6000 units potentially allocated (many more than the 5000 mentioned throughout the plan for the entire area).

- Thinking about Wetherby, building at Thorp Arch and Spen Common (only 3 miles between each other) will just knock off numbers from the allocation and does not solve any other problem – indeed creates many more. It is too much for one area, it is a rural area, not a City, and it simply cannot be right to impose 2 huge builds on an area simply because someone has arbitrarily allocated a figure of homes in this area without any consideration as to the actual market in this area.

- There is a very poor public transport system to Wetherby itself and Leeds, York or Harrogate and beyond for work – most people living in Wetherby and villages use cars to travel out of necessity not just choice. By planning homes where there is no employment, infrastructure and actual market requirement, this leads to deprivation or ploughing money and effort into building supporting infrastructure which will end up creating effectively a New Town swallowing up Thorp Arch Village, Boston Spa Village, Clifford Village and Bramham Village into 'New Wetherby'. Why not build where there are jobs and people desperate for homes where the transport is in place instead? I am not entirely sure that this has been thought through in sufficient detail.

- The decision and allocation seems to be political rather than social. It is notable that the plan calls the whole area "The City". Wetherby and Villages are rural and should be treated in a different way for development purposes.

- Looking at the rural area of the entire Outer North East area hardly any building is planned around the A64 and A58 nearer to the Leeds Ring Road compared with Wetherby and also virtually none in the A61 and surrounding area. If small developments which are more sustainable were spread across the whole area the targets could be met and need across the area be met without having to create a whole new town in the outer reaches just to tick a box.

- I am not clear as to how the value range of properties is considered here – is the housing going to be mixed for social and private housing including for the elderly? This will surely impact the infrastructure needs further. It will also affect where private homes are built with developers more keen on the outlying areas with more affluent potential customers and more money in their pockets and social need being not taken into account.

- It is crucial that planning permission for ANY multi unit sites is subject to providing infrastructure either through funding or building what is needed as part of the scheme - from playgrounds to health centres and roads.

- Ultimately I suggest that LCC re-looks at the allocation across all the areas and considers closer at best fit to EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE AND SOCIETAL/EMPLOYMENT NEED.

---

**Name: Susan Bentley**

**Representor No: PRS06374**

Representation ID: REP07396      Question Ref: General comment

Greenspace

General comment

Weetwood appears to have a very large amount of outdoors sports provision but most of this is university owned and and not freely available to the residents of Leeds.

---

**Name: Gerald Marsden**

**Representor No: PRS06381**

Representation ID: REP07397      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am having difficulty in interpreting your website. May I have details of the officers proposals for site allocation in Clifford. I have lived in Clifford for over 40 years and in that time the school has been closed and built on, the garage closed and built on the shops closed and converted into residential accommodation. The health/doctors practice closed and houses continue to pop up all over. We now have an uncontrolled mess with just a slab of residential property with no facilities and abandoned control over our environment. It is some time since our councillors were down Mill

Dam but promises to keep me advised have not yet materialised. Some might say that some councillors and the PM are full of eastern promise and it is yet to be seen whether like chocolate their promises just melt away. VOTE UKIP NEXT TIME THEY PROMISE TO PROTECT OUR GREEN BELT.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Anna Ortega**

**Representor No: PRS06383**

Representation ID: REP07402      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I was just wondering if the settlement boundary has been revised, does the UDP Proposals map represent the most up to date version? It does not seem to be included within the site allocations DPD, will it be revised in a later document?

---

**Name: David Kendrew**

**Representor No: PRS06384**

Representation ID: REP07403      Question Ref: H10

Housing

site 1:  
Land on north east site of Rodley Lane,  
Rodley

Further to viewing the issues and options for the Leeds Site Allocations plan, please see attached two sites on Rodley Lane, Rodley, which we own the freehold and would like to make available and submit for consideration for the site allocations.

We would like these to be considered primarily for residential, or alternatively as commercial uses, as we feel that the sites are ideal locations and sizes to enhance and extend the much needed offering in Rodley.

We would also like to submit them as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Applications and the completed forms are attached.

Vacant land 0.532 approx.

Existing use - car park, surrounding uses – residential, industrial.

No applications in last 5 years.

Proposed uses: houses, flats, industrial, distribution/warehousing, retail, offices.

Constraints – lack of utility supplies.

How can be overcome – utilities can be installed on site and extended from existing surrounding supplies.

Planning permission expected 2014, no demolition, commencement on site 2015, completion 2015.

Site 2:  
Aire View Court  
Rodley Lane  
Rodley  
LS13 1AA

Further to viewing the issues and options for the Leeds Site Allocations plan, please see attached two sites on Rodley Lane, Rodley, which we own the freehold and would like to make available and submit for consideration for the site allocations.

We would like these to be considered primarily for residential, or alternatively as commercial uses, as we feel that the sites are ideal locations and sizes to enhance and extend the much needed offering in Rodley.

We would also like to submit them as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Applications and the completed forms are attached.

Existing use - Industrial.

0.425 approx.

Surrounding uses – residential, industrial.

Planning application – change of use from B1 to B2 12/01320/FU.

Proposed uses: houses, flats, retail, offices.

Physical constraints – none.

Legal constraints – three tenants in occupation on short term leases.

How can be overcome – wait until lease expiry or break option exercised.

Planning permission expected 2015, demolition 2016, commencement on site 2016, completion 2016.

# General Comments

Name: White

Representor No: PRS06386

Representation ID: REP07405 Question Ref: H10

Housing

1.7 This document has been prepared to demonstrate the suitability of the site at Spring Lea Farm, Troydale for removal from the green belt and allocation for housing through the Leeds Local Development Framework process. The site has not been included in the 2013 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) therefore this document provides further information which can be used to assess the site with the intention of including the site in the 2014 SHLAA review.

1.8 The nature of the Local Development Framework process introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 is such that front loading of information and the confirmation of delivery timescales is integral to the development plan process from the outset to ensure that proper and due consideration is given to such schemes at the earliest possible opportunity.

1.9 This document specifically addresses the site at Troydale Lane, Pudsey and seeks to demonstrate why its formal allocation should be encouraged. This presentation departs from the responses to the standard questions insofar as the site is at the introductory stage in the SHLAA process.

2.0 Housing

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.

The Site

2.1 The site is located to the north of Troydale Lane, Pudsey and is approximately 2km to the south east of Pudsey town centre. It is approximately 7km to the west of Leeds city centre and 8km to the east of Bradford city centre. The site extends to approximately 10.5ha and the majority of the site comprises of fields with a number of greenhouses and rhubarb sheds on the site.

2.2 The surrounding land uses are mixed. Immediately to the south of the site is residential development. This is the Barratt Homes development, Troydale Park, of approximately 42 dwellings, constructed within the past 5 years on the former Troydale Mills site. There is also commercial and industrial development on Troydale Lane to the south. To the east is woodland which forms part of Pudsey Beck Woods. To the west are fields and to the north are fields and woodland.

2.3 There is a bus stop to the south of the site on Troydale Lane where the 62A bus services from Pudsey to Seacroft via Leeds city centre and Cross Green can be accessed every hour. The 90 bus service from Leeds city centre to Greengates via Troydale and Pudsey provides an evening service. The 709 bus service travels to Troydale from Bradford, Thornbury and Pudsey. The site is approximately 3km from Bramley railway station, which has regular trains to Leeds, Bradford, Halifax and Manchester. Suitable vehicular access to the site can be provided from Troydale Lane where there is a frontage onto the adopted highway. The site is approximately 800m from Tong Road, where further bus services can be accessed including the 205 bus service from Dewsbury to Pudsey via Morley.

2.4 The site has good access to local schools; Cranshaw secondary school is approximately 2km away on Robin Lane and Lowtown primary school is

approximately 1.7km from the site. There are existing retail and leisure facilities in Pudsey and Bramley town centres, including supermarkets and industrial areas close by in Stanningley. The site would provide a sustainable extension to Troydale where new residents would be able to access employment, retail and leisure opportunities in both Leeds and Bradford.

3.0 Policy

3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (adopted March 2012) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

3.2 The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. There are three dimensions to sustainable development:

economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:

- an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;
- a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and
- an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy (paragraph 7).

3.3 At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking (paragraph 14). "Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth" (paragraph 17).

3.4 The National Planning Policy Framework states in respect of plan making and local plans that Local Plans are the key to delivering sustainable development that reflects the vision and aspirations of local communities.

3.5 The Government's key housing objective in the National Planning Policy Framework is "To boost significantly the supply of housing" (paragraph 47). In his announcements which accompanied the Framework, the Minister for Planning emphasises the three objectives for planning reform one of which is "to ensure that we support the building of homes that the next generation will need". To deliver this objective the Framework requires local planning authorities to "ensure their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area" (paragraph 47). "Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites." Where a local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of

deliverable sites, existing policies relating to supply of housing will be considered out of date and the case for the presumption in favour of sustainable development will carry greater weight in the determination of planning applications. (NPPF paragraph 49).

3.6 The Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) will be replaced by the Local Development Framework. Until such time, the Leeds UDPR remains the statutory development plan for the Leeds district.

3.7 In the Publication Draft Leeds Core Strategy (published February 2012), the site is in the emerging Core Strategy Outer West housing market area. Spatial Policy 7 identifies the Outer West housing market characteristic area should have 4,700 houses which is 7% of the total housing distribution.

3.8 Spatial policy 1: Location of Development To deliver the spatial development strategy based on the Leeds settlement hierarchy, the broad spatial framework for the location and scale of development is:

i) To concentrate the majority of new development within urban areas taking advantage of existing services, high levels of accessibility and priorities for urban regeneration and an appropriate balance of brownfield and greenfield land. The largest amount of development will be located in the Main Urban Area with Major Settlements delivering significant amounts of development.

Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability.

ii) That settlements within the hierarchy will guide the identification of land for development, with priority given in the following order:

# General Comments

Name: White

Representor No: PRS06386

- a. Previously development land and buildings within the settlement,
- b. Other suitable infill sites within the relevant settlement,
- c. Key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement.
- iii) For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods.

3.9 Spatial Policy 6: The Housing Requirement and Allocation of Housing Land 70,000 (net) new dwellings between 2012 and 2028 will be accommodated at a rate of:

- ☐ 3,660 per annum from 2012/13 to the end of 2016/17 (18,300)
- ☐ 4,700 per annum from 2017/18 (51,700)

Delivery of 500 dwellings per annum (8,000 over the plan period) is anticipated on small and unidentified sites. Guided by the Settlement Hierarchy, the Council will identify 66,000 dwellings gross (62,000 net) to achieve the distribution in tables H2 and H3 in Spatial Policy 7 using the following considerations:

- i) Sustainable Locations (which meet standards of public transport accessibility), supported by existing or access to new local facilities and services,
- ii) Preference for brownfield and regeneration sites,
- iii) The least impact on Green Belt purposes,
- iv) Opportunities to enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities through the design and standard of new homes,
- v) The need for realistic lead in times and build out rates for housing construction,
- vi) The least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation.
- vii) Generally avoiding or mitigating areas of flood risk.

3.10 The site is close to 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 realise 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 foot, cycle, rail and road access, improvements to green infrastructure, and increased

business competitiveness and growth. The development of this site would provide investment in the area; deliver a proportion of affordable housing and new greenspace.

3.11 The site is currently in the Green Belt in the Leeds UDPR (adopted 2006). The draft Core Strategy states that "a selective review of the Green Belt will need to be carried out to accommodate the scale of housing and employment growth identified in Spatial Policy 6 as well as an additional contingency to create new Protected Areas of Search. The selective review will generally consider Green Belt release around:

- i) The Main Urban Area (Leeds city centre and surrounding areas forming the main urban and suburban areas of the city)
- ii) Major settlements of Garforth, Guiseley/Yeadox/Rawdon, Morley, Otley, Rothwell and Wetherby
- iii) Smaller Settlements".

3.12 The site is located close to the Main Urban Area boundary of Pudsey and the regeneration priority area.

## 4.0 Green Belt

4.1 Troydale is a small village in the villages and rural category of the proposed settlement hierarchy contained in the Submission draft Core Strategy. However it is very close to the Leeds Main Urban Area (MUA) at Pudsey. SHLAA site submissions 3050 and 1184 are given a 'Green' status by the City Council in the initial Site Allocations Plan.

4.2 The site has well defined, defensible boundaries so the development of the site would not lead to unrestricted sprawl or ribbon development. Natural and physical features provide a good existing barrier with woodland to the east and roads to the south and a tree and hedge line to the west/north west.

4.3 Consequently the subject site exhibits significant visual and physical containment and new long term defensible Green Belt boundaries can be clearly defined. The site currently has some development on it which reduces the key Green Belt attribute of openness. The visual containment of the site and its close association with development in Troydale add to the case for removal from the Green Belt. Access to the open countryside can be retained and enhanced.

4.4 The development of this land either on its own in association with the settlement of Troydale or in association with the 'Green' rated sites to the west can be achieved via good master planning and urban design so that urban sprawl and the coalescence of towns is avoided.

Representation ID: REP07405      Question Ref: H11

Housing

1.6 We welcome the fact that the Site Allocations DPD does not include any suggested phasing of sites at this stage. We maintain our overall objection to Draft Policy H1 of the Core Strategy in relation to the criteria for phasing the release of housing allocations



# General Comments

---

**Name: White**

**Representor No: PRS06386**

Representation ID: REP07405      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

New Site (See scanned REP for attached plans of proposed site)

1.1 Johnson Brook Planning and Development act on behalf of the landowners of the site demarcated by a red line boundary in the appended plan.

1.2 This representation has been made on behalf of Mr and Mrs White by Johnson Brook, a new planning consultancy established in June 2013 following the acquisition of planning projects and staff of Dacres Planning team. Previous representations submitted on behalf of our client under Dacres Planning still remain valid, it is merely the Agent name that has altered.

1.3 Notwithstanding the site specific comments in the later section of this representation we would like to advise caution in relation to the timing of this Local Plan Site Allocations document, given the outstanding objections to the Leeds Core Strategy, and the reliance of the Allocations DPD on the Core Strategy. That said, we understand that the Council need to progress with the Site Allocations DPD and welcome the acknowledgement in Volume 1 paragraph 4.1 that should the Core Strategy change from the current proposals the site specific proposals and allocations in the Site Allocations Plan will be amended to reflect the requirements of adopted Core Strategy.

1.4 There remain outstanding objections to the Core Strategy, of particular relevance are those relating to the overall quantum of housing requirement and the proposed distribution of the requirement. Our representations submitted on behalf of a consortium of house builders recommended that the overall housing requirement should be increased to conform with the Council's own SHMA evidence of housing need. Should the housing requirement increase, the Site Allocations DPD will obviously need to consider its initial appraisal of promoted sites in order to conform with the Core Strategy requirements.

1.5 As currently drafted, the Site Allocations DPD plans for a residual target of accommodating 34,067 dwellings. This assumes a total requirement of 66,000 units and an existing supply of 31,933 units which comprises previous UDP housing allocations not developed, planning permissions with units still remaining to be built, and sites covered by the Aire Valley Area Action Plan. We maintain our objections to Leeds Site Allocations Plan – Issues and Options July 2013 On behalf of Mr and Mrs White Site reference – Spring Lea Farm, Troydale Road, Pudsey the 66,000 requirement and also do not agree with the Council's existing supply position. On behalf of the development industry we, along with other planning

consultants have undertaken a review of the Council's supply position and conclude that it is considerably lower than the Council's position. Whilst Volume 1 Plan Overview document has a caveat at paragraph 8.3 referring to the fact that the housing target could change, it is considered appropriate to refer to the various layers of concern with the Council's housing matters.

---

**Name: Jill Bolton**

**Representor No: PRS06387**

Representation ID: REP07409      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Green Lane — Linton Livery Stables and Adjoining Paddock

Representations have been made to the Linton Steering Group by the landowners of Linton Livery Stables and the adjoining paddock to the south of the livery and their professional advisor. This site has been named "the Green Lane Site" (GL) for the purposes of preparation of the Linton Neighbourhood Plan. Although no application has yet been made for GL to be included in the SHLAA, we anticipate that LCC may receive representations from the landowners of GL, or their professional representative, relating to the possible development of GL for residential housing. If such representations are made, then we would wish GL to be rejected as a possible development site under the current process.

---

**Name: Keith Midgley**

**Representor No: PRS06388**

Representation ID: REP07414      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Map 5 ref 1669

We fully support this proposal for this site. This is existing greenbelt land and all of Wetherby Golf Club land and must all be permanently protected open space only for recreational use as it has always been in the past and is also required to be for the future. It is of great benefit to all that use it and view it from the surrounding areas.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Mr & Mrs Murphy**

**Representor No: PRS06390**

Representation ID: REP07417      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Re: Site Allocations – (11) Outer West

We are writing to raise our objections to the building of any houses in Calverley Village.

According to 'Wikipedia', Calverley is a rural village (a village being a small municipality close to the countryside).

It is an ancient parish and a place of special character.

It needs to stay this way.

Calverley is almost at bursting point already.

We have one Doctors surgery that struggles already to cope with current demand..

We have limited public transport, no fire station, no coach/train station, no hospital and no police station.

Our schools are also over-subscribed.

In the winter months our roads are rarely, if ever gritted and the main arterial road to Bradford can occasionally close due to ice and/or drifting snow.

Further development of already congested suburbs is not the answer.

According to Councillor Pickles, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government " it is absolutely vital that Green Belt Land is protected as indeed are communities who live in and around it".

Utilisation of Green Belt land for building is environmental vandalism.

The focus should be on utilising the numerous brown field sites in Leeds which need investment to develop and support regeneration.

Obviously these areas may be less attractive for developers but the emphasis has to be not what is best for them but what is best for the communities.

Also to be considered are the 7,000 plus empty properties in Leeds which need to be brought back in to use.

We need to retain Green Belt land to sustain the ecology and to prevent urban sprawl into village areas otherwise our countryside will disappear bit by bit.

All the identified sites for Calverley would represent a significant incursion into Green Belt land and would set a precedent for further sprawl.

Our Green Belt land should be safeguarded / protected, as is the case in the Outer North West area, so that it cannot be considered for future development.

We emphatically oppose the building of any properties on any Green Belt land in Calverley both now and in the future.

Looking at the Site Allocation plans, we have collated and produced some data, please see table below.

The merging of different wards for the purpose of housing site allocations is misleading and appears to be an exercise for balancing area numbers with little other value. In such proposals, considerations must be given to an individual place and its unique characteristics. For example Armley, Farnley and Wortley are on the edge of the urban city of Leeds. Whereas Calverley is a small, unspoilt rural historic village.

Viewing the table below, it is clear that both Outer North West and Aireborough have significantly more space per head of population than Outer West. It is incredulous that you have identified 87 sites for assessment in Outer West, but only 32 and 40, (a total of 72) for the combined mass areas of Outer North West and Aireborough. This is further compounded by the paltry number of green coded sites in Outer North West and Aireborough.

---

**Name: Mr Lee Taylor Mr Richard Jagielski**

**Representor No: PRS06391**

Representation ID: REP07420      Question Ref: E4

Employment

These representations are submitted on behalf of Mr Lee Taylor in relation to the land at Hawksworth Nurseries, Hawksworth Lane, Leeds.

Site available.

We have previously made representations for this site to be allocated for housing (see attached). However in the alternative we suggest that this site maybe allocated as a local employment allocation for local employment uses.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Mark Chetham**

**Representor No: PRS06393**

Representation ID: REP07427      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing to you to express my deep concern regarding the Site Allocation Plan.

General observations

This is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to adopt the right approach for the whole of Leeds and as such short-term thinking by politicians, planners, developers and residents should be avoided.

Whilst some effort has obviously been made to advertise the consultation, I have the following concerns:

Most of my neighbours (and I've spoken to most of Layton Lane) were not aware that the process was even underway. Looming summer holidays probably play a part, but I was probably one of the few that heard the adverts on local radio.

As an IT professional I found the website difficult to navigate and use – whilst a lot of effort has gone in to the documentation it is not user-friendly and does not appear to be designed to make it easy for people to understand and engage with.

I am interested in how the sites were put forward/allocated and will be making representations under the freedom of information act to understand the governance processes (terms of reference, attendees, agendas, meeting minutes etc.) and establish the openness and criteria by which the earlier stages of the process have been carried out. I was disappointed that there was no briefing session in Rawdon and that the session in Horsforth school was neither well-advertised or well-signposted – unless you knew it was there, there was little chance of noticing it. Whilst I understand the need for development, it seems that a more joined up approach which uses this process as an opportunity to set the direction for the future development of Leeds is much more desirable than a closed, short-term, housing development-biased plan.

---

**Name: David Airy**

**Representor No: PRS06394**

Representation ID: REP07785      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Morrisons Supermarkets Plc**

**Representor No: PRS06404**

Representation ID: REP07470      Question Ref: CCR4

Retail

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.

Site Allocations Issues and Options Plan Overview (Volume 1)

Morrisons supports the hierarchy of retail centres as defined in Map 3. Morrisons also supports the identification of Primary Shopping Area boundaries and Primary and Secondary Frontages (where appropriate).

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.

Plan 2.2 B: Leeds City Centre- we support the inclusion of the Morrisons foodstore at the Merrion Centre as part of the Proposed Primary Frontage

We would be grateful if Peacock and Smith are kept informed on further stages in the preparation of Local Development Framework documents.

# General Comments

**Name: Hadfield Contracts**

**Representor No: PRS06407**

Representation ID: REP07461      Question Ref: H10

Housing

This response is made to the consultation currently being carried out on the Site Allocations Plan – Issues and Options.

We object to the lack of inclusion of our Clients land at Daisy Mill, Morley. We believe that the site offers the opportunity to provide housing development and to this end should be allocated for residential development in the Site Allocations Plan.

We prepared a supporting document earlier this year, on how the site could be developed and this was submitted as part of the call for sites. We have included this document again with this representation. The site in question does not appear to have been considered as a potential allocation as it has not been colour coded. Indeed it remains as proposed greenspace.

Housing

Volume 2: 10 Outer South West

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.

The Site

The site is situated off Daisy Hill which is located to the north east of Morley Town Centre. The site comprises of some 0.9 hectares gross. Residential development is situated to the eastern and southern boundaries and it is considered that the development of this site with residential use would appropriately round off this area of Morley.

It is currently designated as N5 in the adopted Leeds UDPR, which states:

N5: the city council will seek both itself and in Partnership with other agencies to improve the quantity and quality of greenspace provision through a phased programme for the acquisition and laying out of new greenspaces, outdoor recreation facilities and footpaths, and the extension of existing greenspaces.

The site has not come forward during the plan period for open space and given the site is within private ownership then the Council would need to pursue compulsory purchase proceedings to secure the site. We would therefore suggest that the site should be re-considered as a housing allocation.

The site is adjacent to the built area of Morley and is approximately 800m from Morley town centre.

In Morley town centre there are a range of shops and services such as a supermarket, banks, building societies, estate agents, hairdressers, cafes and pubs. There are also numerous community and leisure facilities in Morley such as a library, churches, a town hall, and a gym and fitness club.

The site has good access to public transport, education and local health facilities. The site is within 400m walking radius of Morley railway station where regular train services via the Huddersfield Line to Leeds, Dewsbury and Huddersfield can be accessed.

There are bus stops on New Bank Street (within 200m of the site) and Victoria Road (within 400m of the site). The following bus services can be accessed:

213 – Dewsbury and Batley

51, 52, 55 & 87 – Leeds, Meanwood, Headingley, Crossgates, Bramley

The site is extremely well placed to access local education facilities. The nearest primary schools are 800m away.

Policy

The allocation of this site for housing development is consistent with the adopted National Planning Policy Framework. This states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. The Framework states that every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. The objectives for the Framework include building a strong competitive economy, promoting sustainable transport and delivering a wide choice of high quality homes. The development of the land at Daisy Hill is consistent with these objectives.

Conclusions

The supporting document shows the developability of this site which has the capacity for circa 21 dwellings, and public open space.

The site has a strong likelihood of early delivery as Hadfield Contracts are keen to commence development. The site is available, achievable and developable in the short term.

Site Plan Attached

# General Comments

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP07466 Question Ref: H1

Housing

3445A - disagree should be amber - see submitted representation for full details

It is recognised that part of this site has the potential to infill the frontage of Leadmill Lane. It is not considered, however, that development should extend further east or north than 146 Leadmill Lane. The Green Belt in this location is open and there is no defined boundary to the north and east of the site which would contain development or prevent it from encroaching towards Rothwell. The potential for sprawl and coalescence is considered to be greater than low.

Representation ID: REP07891 Question Ref: H7

Housing

Other than site 3081B, we agree that sites that have been identified as red in the Outer South Market Character Area are not suitable for allocation for future housing development.

Representation ID: REP07891 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

[representation summarises Core Strategy approach]. Pegasus do not dispute that Leeds' extant UDP housing allocations may currently be considered to be specific deliverable sites sufficient to contribute to a five year housing land supply, where there is a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. However, historic housing allocations should be subject to the same level of scrutiny and consultation prior to being identified as developable over the plan period, otherwise the plan cannot be considered sound. Our position is that extant UDP housing allocations should be objectively assessed as part of the Site Assessment process.

Other than for the Green Belt assessment, there is no accompanying methodology to explain the procedures for deriving or analysing site information. We question the transparency and robustness of the Council's approach in this regard. By way of an example; there is no explanation in the Site Allocations Plan of the scoring/ranking attributed to the section 'Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements' on the pro-forma. How has scoring been attributed for accessibility, access and local network? What are the respective score thresholds? It has proven difficult to comment on the relative highway, access and accessibility attributes of individual sites and provide meaningful comments without full knowledge of how a score has been derived. We reserve the right to comment further upon the assessment methodology and its outputs during subsequent consultations of the plan.

Priority at settlement level will firstly be to previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, other suitable infill sites, then key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement. It is evident from the Site Assessments for the Outer South East MCA that limited opportunities exist to meet the housing requirement without looking to sustainable greenfield extension sites.

Our comments relating to the Inner Area and Outer South West Area are in regard to the identification and delineation of boundaries of these Market Character Areas. We do not consider that they accurately represent logical or appropriate geographic areas and we consider that they should be re-drawn. The purpose of defining Housing Market Characteristic Areas is to reflect the diverse nature and characteristics of housing markets across the city. These areas should take account of topographical and settlement spatial definitions as well as operational housing markets in terms of house prices and land values. They reflect geographical areas that people tend to associate with finding properties to live in. It is not evident why the settlement of Robin Hood with Lofthouse has been split between three different housing market areas – Inner, Outer South and Outer South West. Robin Hood with Lofthouse is a defined settlement within a geographic area demonstrating comparative market conditions thus logic would dictate that the entirety of the settlement is considered within a single market area. We therefore consider that the Market Character Area for the Outer South area should be re-drawn to include the entirety of the settlement of Robin Hood with Lofthouse. The M1/M621 forms a clear and defined geographic boundary between Inner Leeds/Outer South West Leeds and Outer South Leeds. It would be a logical boundary to separate market areas.

Representation ID: REP07893 Question Ref: General comment

Retail

Pegasus recognise the important service role of the city's shopping centres and supports the principle of, where needed, accommodating new retail development.

Representation ID: REP07894 Question Ref: G2

Greenspace

The provision of greenspace in a local area should be based on qualitative as well as quantitative considerations. We do not object to changing the typology of greenspaces where there is robust and up-to-date evidence to demonstrate that such action is necessary and suitable.

# General Comments

---

**Name: C Makin**

**Representor No: PRS06414**

Representation ID: REP07894      Question Ref: G3

Greenspace

Access to open spaces and opportunities for sport, 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. Leeds City Council should therefore give careful consideration to this policy framework prior to identifying housing allocations on greenspace sites identified through the Green Space Audit.

Representation ID: REP07894      Question Ref: G4

Greenspace

We agree with the principle that resources from chargeable development can be used towards infrastructure that is needed as a result of development, and that this may include improving the quality of existing greenspace in suitable locations. Core Strategy Policy G4 provides a mechanism for safeguarding and improving existing greenspace in those areas which have adequate supply. This will enable the local authority to address qualitative deficiencies.

Representation ID: REP07894      Question Ref: G6

Greenspace

We agree that new greenspace should be provided in areas that fall below accessibility distance standards to ensure residents have adequate access to different types of greenspace.

Representation ID: REP07894      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

We welcome the statement in the Site Allocations Plan that opportunities exist to secure areas of strategic open space in the district through the delivery of new housing.

Representation ID: REP08034      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Pegasus disagree that the sites identified as green represent the most suitable sites to consider allocating for future housing development in the Outer South East Market Character Area. It is considered that sites have been included which are not consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF, the Core Strategy or cannot be considered to be deliverable or developable.

# General Comments

**Name: C Makin**

**Representor No: PRS06414**

Representation ID: REP08034      Question Ref: H2

Housing

Firstly we wish to re-iterate our position in regard to conformity with the spatial development strategy of the district as this should inform whether sites, both singularly and cumulatively, are suitable located. Patterns of growth must be managed according to the settlement hierarchy to ensure that development occurs in the most sustainable locations whilst respecting the overall pattern of development within the district. The Smaller Settlements and rural villages in the Outer South East Market Character Area serve lesser functions and are not as sustainable as the Major Settlement of Garforth. The scale of development at these settlements should be proportionate to their role and function in the Market Character Area and with the spatial priorities for the district. We consider that this needs to be weighed more strongly into the Site Assessment process. An acute example of this is Micklefield; where growth could vastly overwhelm the role and function of the existing small settlement were the identified green, amber or combination of both to be allocated. The same is true of Allerton Bywater and Kippax. Some of the sites identified as green sites in the Outer South East MCA may have the potential to be allocated as housing but we consider that they have issues

827 - Questions exist in regard to the deliverability of this site. Is it reasonable to assume that it is achievable with a realistic prospect of delivery when it was not implemented during the six years it had planning permission and when planning permission has been left to lapse since? It is also noted that the site is within the Strategic Green Infrastructure designation (Core Strategy Spatial Policies 6 & 13).

1044 / CFSM021- We strongly consider that site 1044 / CFSM021 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt of Garforth. It is an open site beyond the urban barrier of the A642 (Wakefield Road) which is not visually contained. It does not benefit from strong defensible barriers.

1100 - We strongly consider that site 1100 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt of Garforth. It is an open site beyond the urban barrier of the A642 (Wakefield Road) which is not visually contained. Without site 1044 it would be an isolated incursion into the Green Belt. It does not benefit from strong defensible barriers.

1176 - We strongly consider that the capacity of sites identified at Micklefield could vastly overwhelm the role and function of this small settlement. We would also query the following matters in terms of being able to demonstrate developability:

- Amenity considerations of nearby open cast operations;
- Junction visibility onto Great North Road;
- Query accessibility scoring; and
- Allotments identified as designated greenspace.

1357 - We would query the high overall access score attributed to the site, particularly as it is noted that highway improvement works will be necessary in order to make site developable. It is noted that the site is within Strategic Green Infrastructure designation (Core Strategy Spatial Policies 6 & 13).

1366 - We question the Council's approach to identifying these three sites collectively as having the greatest potential for housing in the MCA. Individually they do not meet the SHLAA size threshold. They are not physically related to each other. To be developed existing homes would need to be demolished – this raises deliverability issues. If these sites are necessary in order to facilitate access to site 2132 then they should be included within that site. Were they to serve as access points for 2132 then they would not be able to deliver the capacity indicated (38 units).

2040 - We consider that the partial inclusion of this site within the Outer South East MCA is not logical or appropriate. The purpose of defining Housing Market Characteristic Areas is to reflect the diverse nature and characteristics of market areas across the City. These areas take account of topographical and settlement spatial definitions as well as operational housing markets in terms of house prices and land values. They reflect geographical areas that people tend to associate with finding properties to live in. The M1 forms a clear boundary between east Leeds and outer south east Leeds. Site 2040 is not physically or visually linked nor is it considered to be within the same housing market. The boundary of the Outer South East should be redrawn accordingly and site 2040 included wholly within East Leeds MCA.

3100B - We consider that the partial inclusion of this site within the Outer South East MCA is not logical or appropriate. The purpose of defining Housing Market Characteristic Areas is to reflect the diverse nature and characteristics of market areas across the City. These areas take account of topographical and settlement spatial definitions as well as operational housing markets in terms of house prices and land values. They reflect geographical areas that people tend to associate with finding properties to live in. The M1 forms a clear boundary between east Leeds and outer south east Leeds. Site 2040 is not physically or visually linked nor is it considered to be within the same housing market. The boundary of the Outer South East should be redrawn accordingly and site 2040 included wholly within East Leeds MCA. We would also query the following matters:

- The viability of such a steeply sloping site is questioned.
- The Site Assessment does not include the comments/input of highways nor a score for access.

820 (Land south of Micklefield) is a Phase 3 UDP housing allocation for 150 units. The allocation is subject to the provision of satisfactory access from Church Lane and off-site highway improvements to Church Lane. The junction of Church Lane and Ridge Road cannot be made safe without junction improvements to improve visibility. Such works require third party land. Reasonable and viable terms have not been reached in respect of this third party land thus the site cannot be viably developed nor is there a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site. Site 820 should therefore not be green on the draft Plan.

1118 (Land at Manor Farm, Micklefield) is a Phase 3 UDP housing allocation. It is subject to a policy requirement to deliver and/or address a number of wider community infrastructure benefits/issues. As for site 820 off-site highway improvements will be necessary for a development of this scale, particularly in regard to cumulative capacity issues, and as demonstrated above there cannot be a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site in the present circumstances. Site 1118 should therefore not be green on the draft Plan.

# General Comments

**Name: C Makin**

**Representor No: PRS06414**

Representation ID: REP08034      Question Ref: H5

Housing

We do not agree that all the sites that have been identified as amber in the South East Market Character Area represent sites with potential for housing allocation. It is considered that some sites have been included which are not consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF, the Core Strategy or cannot be considered to be deliverable or developable. The Smaller Settlements and rural villages in the Outer South East Market Character Area serve lesser functions and are not as sustainable as the town of Garforth. The scale of development at these settlements should be proportionate to their role and function in the Market Character Area and with the spatial priorities for the district. We consider that this needs to be weighed more strongly into the Site Assessment process. An acute example of this is Micklefield; where the level of growth could vastly overwhelm the role and function of the existing small settlement were the identified green, amber or combination of both to be allocated. The same is true of Allerton Bywater and Kippax. It is imperative to the soundness of the Site Allocations Plan that its policies and proposals have a reasonable prospect of being delivered. The Plan should be prepared in compliance with the policy framework and in association with stakeholders, infrastructure providers and the public in a way that will ensure a reasonable prospect of housing allocations being delivered, and whether there are any insurmountable objections or uncertainties regarding necessary infrastructure for any of those sites.

1004 - We do not consider that sites of ecological value such as Kennett Lane Meadows should be being considered as suitable for residential development sites.

1013 - We strongly consider that site 1013 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt. It will lead to the merging of Swillington and Little Preston. The lack of suitable access is a significant constraint in terms of being able to demonstrate developability. It is also noted that the site capacity in the Site Assessment is incorrect. For a site of 1.2ha the capacity should be around 35, not 100.

1149 - We strongly consider that the capacity of this site could overwhelm the role and function of Allerton Bywater in conflict with the spatial development principles of the Core Strategy. We would also query the following matters in terms of being able to demonstrate developability:

- Development would lead to loss of an area of Natural Greenspace;
- Access into the western portion of the site is limited – reflected in the poor access scoring in the Site Assessment
- The site is within Strategic Green Infrastructure designation (Core Strategy Spatial Policies 6 & 13).

1165 - It is noted that the Site Assessment for site 1165 make assumptions on the basis that the site is suitable in conjunction with other surrounding land. We strongly consider that site 1165 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt. The site is isolated from the settlement. The topography of the land to the south of the motorway results in open

views north across the site. Further to the above we strongly consider that the access constraints (i.e. Barwick Road) would be likely to inhibit the site from being able to demonstrate developability or viability. It is noted that the Council's Highway department do not support the site. We would also query the following matters in terms of being able to demonstrate developability:

- The site is not supported by ecology stakeholders - parts of site are sufficient to be designated Local Wildlife Site and the site is adjacent to Leeds Nature Area (Hawk's Nest Wood).
- It is expected that the planned route of HS2 will significantly impact upon the developability of site 1165.

1173 - We strongly consider that the capacity of sites identified at Micklefield could vastly overwhelm the role and function of this small settlement. Moreover we strongly consider that site 1173 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt. It is not well related to the village and would result in an isolated incursion into the Green Belt. It is also noted that the site is within Strategic Green Infrastructure designation (Core Strategy Spatial Policies 6 & 13).

1174 - The lack of suitable access is a significant constraint in terms of being able to demonstrate developability.

1175 - We strongly consider that site 1175 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt. Development would encroach towards Allerton Bywater. The site does not benefit from strongly defined, defensible barriers. We would also query the following matters in terms of being able to demonstrate developability:

- Ecological value of adjacent SEGI
- Electricity lines cross the site.

It is also noted that the site is within Strategic Green Infrastructure designation (Core Strategy Spatial Policies 6 & 13).

1226 - We strongly consider that site 1226 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt. The site is isolated from the main body of the settlement and is therefore not well connected to the settlement pattern. The railway line forms a physical barrier between the settlement and land to the north. The topography of the land to the south of the motorway results in open views north across the site. Further to the above we strongly consider that the access constraints (i.e. Barwick Road) would be likely to inhibit the site from being able to demonstrate developability or viability. It is noted that the Council's Highway department do not support the site.

1232 - Peckfield Farm forms the southern portion of SHLAA site 1232. It is under separate ownership to Sturton Grange. Sturton Grange is being promoted by Mr C. Makin as a potential site allocation in its own right. We consider that site 1232 does not represent a better opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be less damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt than Sturton Grange. Peckfield Farm has an open arable character with only partial landscape screening to the eastern and southern boundaries. The deliverability or suitability of Peckfield Farm should not prejudice growth at Sturton Grange. Should the Authority support levels of growth sufficient to accommodate the entirety of 1232, we would not object to the southern portion being released from the Green Belt. We maintain, however, that Sturton Grange represents the preferential site.

1244 - It is noted that the Site Assessment for site 1244 make assumptions on the basis that the site can be viably developed in conjunction with other surrounding land. The fact that the site is undeliverable without access from other adjoining land is a significant constraint. It is also advised that this site is presently tenanted.

1270 - We strongly consider that the capacity of sites identified at Micklefield could vastly overwhelm the role and function of this small settlement. Moreover we strongly consider that site 1270 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt. It is not well related to the village and would result in an isolated incursion into the Green Belt. The



# General Comments

**Name: C Makin**

**Representor No: PRS06414**

topography of the site means it is prominent in the landscape. We would also query the following matters in terms of being able to demonstrate developability:

- The site has no road frontage to Pit Lane or Great North Road. Access via The Crescent unsuitable. Undeliverable without access from other adjoining land.
- Amenity considerations of nearby open cast operations
- The viability of such a steeply sloping site with potential land contamination issues is questioned.

It is noted that the Site Assessment for site 1270 is incorrect – it wrongly includes the infrastructure assessment for site 1321. Site 1270 should have a lower highway score.

2032 - The immediate area is characterised by industrial and business uses. These uses dominate how the area functions. Whilst residential properties exist nearby – new residential uses may not be compatible with the industrial character. Para 123 of the NPPF regarding amenity and continuance of existing businesses is relevant. We would also query whether the site is capable of being adequately accessed. Existing local policy prevent further development in this area until such time as there are improvements to the highway facilities. Ash Lane is an unadopted private road which does not meet the standards required for an industrial road in the Leeds Street Design Guide (SDG). An appeal decision for the site in 2011 (APP/N4720/A/10/2138574) has upheld that the highway facilities are inadequate and development (in this case employment) would have an unacceptable effect on highway safety. The same conclusions would apply to residential development.

2091 - It is noted that Ash Lane Pitch is proposed to be retained for Outdoor Sports provision. We do not consider that sites of sports and recreation value such as Ash Lane should be being considered as suitable for residential development sites. Furthermore, the immediate area is characterised by industrial and business uses. These uses dominate how the area functions. Whilst residential properties exist nearby, new residential uses may not be compatible with the industrial character. Para 123 of the NPPF regarding amenity and continuance of existing businesses is relevant.

2131 - It is noted that site 2131 is proposed to be retained for natural greenspace provision. We do not consider that sites of amenity and recreation value should be being considered as suitable for residential development sites. We agree with the Site Assessment that the presence of significant tree coverage across the site presents a constraint to developability.

2132 - It is our view that access is a significant constraint to the delivery of site 2132. It is already acknowledged in the Site Assessment that access options are limited; that highway mitigation will be necessary and that, assuming suitable access can be achieved, capacity will need to be constrained. Given the nature of the site and the complexity of its access, is there a reasonable prospect it will be available for development and is it viable?

2156 / CFSM028 - We strongly consider that site 2156 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt. The northern edge of Garforth is defined by impermeable built form at Lotherton Way Industrial Estate which provides a good existing barrier between the urban area and undeveloped land to the north. The site provides footpath circuits and links, including linking to the Leeds Country Way, pedestrian tunnels beneath the M1 and Hawk's Nest Wood. The topography of the land to the south of the motorway results in open views north across the site. Further to the above we strongly consider that the access constraints (i.e. Barwick Road) would be likely to inhibit the site from being able to Demonstrate developability or viability. It is noted that the Council's Highway department do not support the site. We would also query the following matters in terms of being able to demonstrate developability:

- The site is not supported by ecology stakeholders - parts of site are sufficient to be designated Local Wildlife Site and the site is adjacent to a Leeds Nature Area (Hawk's Nest Wood)
- It is expected that the planned route of HS2 will impact upon the developability of the northern portion of the site.
- Land stability – reclamation of opencast mine. The Council must be satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect that the site is available. A site is considered available where there is confidence that there are no legal ownership problems such as multiple ownerships or ransom strips or operational requirements of landowners.

2157 - We strongly consider that the capacity of sites identified at Micklefield could vastly overwhelm the role and function of this small settlement. This site in particular would have a significant impact upon the character of the settlement. Moreover we strongly consider that site 2157A does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt. The potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl is high - it is an open expansive site with no definite or defensible boundaries. It would not serve to 'round off' the village but would instead subsume the existing envelope. We would argue that the Council's justification for rejecting site 2157B are equally applicable to site 2157A and both should be dismissed on the basis of the matters discussed above.

3109A - We strongly consider that site 3109A does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt. The site is only partial adjacent to the built-up area of Kippax and most of the site would be an isolated incursion into the Green Belt. It does not have strong defensible boundaries to prevent future sprawl. We would also query whether highway constraints exist in terms of capacity and upgrade of Brecks lane.

3109C - We strongly consider that site 3109C does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt. The site would encroach into the gap between Garforth and Kippax. It does not have strong defensible boundaries to prevent future sprawl. We would also query the following matters in terms of being able to demonstrate developability:

- Highway constraints in terms of capacity and upgrade of RoachGrange Avenue.
- The viability of such a steeply sloping site.

3110 - It is noted that the Site Assessment for site 3110 make assumptions on the basis that the site can be viably developed in conjunction with other surrounding land. The fact that the site is undeliverable without access from other adjoining land is a significant constraint.

3111 - No Council Site Assessment provided, assumed to be being brought forward with 3112, therefore conclusions same: We strongly consider that site 3112 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt of Garforth. It is an open site which is not visually contained. It is prominently located at the brow of the approach to Garforth. It is beyond the urban barrier of the A642. It is an isolated incursion into the Green Belt. It does not benefit from strong defensible barriers.

3112 - We strongly consider that site 3112 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt of Garforth. It is an open site which is not visually contained. It is prominently located at the brow of the approach to Garforth. It is beyond the urban barrier of the A642. It is an isolated incursion into the Green Belt. It does not benefit from strong defensible barriers.

# General Comments

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

3113 - It is noted that the Site Assessment for site 3113 make assumptions on the basis that the site is suitable in conjunction with other surrounding land. We strongly consider that site 3113 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt. It is an isolated incursion into the Green Belt well beyond the urban barrier of the A642. It does not benefit from strong defensible barriers.

3321 - Core Strategy Policy SP10 is clear that no Green Belt review will take place at the rural village tier. Green Belt land at Great Preston should not be considered suitable on this basis. Notwithstanding the above, we strongly consider that site 3321 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt. Development would lead to the coalescence of Great Preston and Allerton Bywater. The justification for the rejection of site 3463 states that there is only a small existing gap between these settlements so retaining separation is important – this should also apply here. It does not benefit from strong defensible barriers to the south. It is also noted that the site is within Strategic Green Infrastructure designation (Core Strategy Spatial Policies 6 & 13).

Representation ID: REP08034 Question Ref: H7

Housing

We agree that the sites that have been identified as red in the Outer South East Market Character Area are not suitable for allocation for future housing development.

Representation ID: REP08034 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

[Representation summarises Core Strategy approach].

Pegasus do not dispute that Leeds' extant UDP housing allocations may currently be considered to be specific deliverable sites sufficient to contribute to a five year housing land supply, where there is a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. However, historic housing allocations should be subject to the same level of scrutiny and consultation prior to being identified as developable over the plan period, otherwise the plan cannot be considered sound. Our position is that extant UDP housing allocations should be objectively assessed as part of the Site Assessment process. [Includes table showing lime green sites and latest permissions and capacities].

There is no assessment in the Site Allocations Plan as to whether these extant UDP sites in the Outer South East MCA represent the most appropriate strategy in the context of the spatial development strategy in the Core Strategy and the achievement of sustainable development. Can the local authority be confident that extant UDP allocations still represent deliverable, developable sites for growth over the emerging plan period? It is our view that the UDP allocations in the Outer South East MCA should not be predetermined as deliverable or developable sites in the emerging plan. They should be subject to the same scrutiny as other sites in the Outer South East MCA, and were they to be so it would be evident that they have deliverability and developability constraints. To illustrate this point we draw attention to the deliverability specifically of UDP allocation H3.3A-31 (site ref. 820). Policy H3.3A- 31 sets out that highway improvements are necessary at the junction of Ridge Road and Church Lane to facilitate the development of this UDP allocation. Junction improvements at Church Lane/Ridge Road are not capable of being achieved without third party land. We would therefore argue that H3.3A-31 is not available now; there is not a reasonable prospect that it can come forward and its viability is questionable. This underlines the fundamental need to objectively assess extant UDP allocations as part of the Site Allocations Plan process.

Secondly, as discussed elsewhere in this statement it is our view that, notwithstanding the deliverability of such UDP allocations, committing in excess of 660 units (UDP allocations H3.3A-31 and H3.3A-32 plus 'green' PAS site 1176) to a Smaller Settlement such as Micklefield which has only a basic level of services and an existing population of 820 households (Census, 2011), would significantly undermine the spatial objectives of the Core Strategy whereby the scale of growth in Smaller Settlements has regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. For this reason the extant UDP allocations in the Outer South East MCA should be assessed to be determined if they are the most appropriate strategy. For the purposes of calculating a residual target for future housing sites, the Local Planning Authority should exclude extant UDP allocations H3.3A-31 and H3.3A-32. [representation includes revised Table 9.3.1 – Existing permissions (as at 31/3/12) & UDP allocations with full permission]. It is evident from the above exercise that the number of units to be identified from developable sites over the plan period is greater than indicated at paragraph 9.3.2. There is a minimum requirement to identify 3,796 units in the Outer South East MCA over the plan period not 3,534 units.

Other than for the Green Belt assessment, there is no accompanying methodology to explain the procedures for deriving or analysing site information. We question the transparency and robustness of the Council's approach in this regard. By way of an example; there is no explanation in the Site Allocations Plan of the scoring/ranking attributed to the section 'Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements' on the pro-forma. How has scoring been attributed for accessibility, access and local network? What are the respective score thresholds? It has proven difficult to comment on the relative highway, access and accessibility attributes of individual sites and provide meaningful comments without full knowledge of how a score has been derived. We reserve the right to comment further upon the assessment methodology and its outputs during subsequent consultations of the plan.

Kippax, Allerton Bywater, Micklefield and Swillington serve Smaller Settlement roles in the South East Market Character Area. They provide a lower level of services than Garforth and are less well-connected to the strategic road and rail network. The relative sustainability and function of these settlements and their contribution to development needs is a matter which we will comment upon in regard to individual sites, however, our position is that the local authority should be looking to Garforth to deliver significant amounts of development, and the majority of development in the Outer South East Market Character Area in compliance with the Spatial Development Strategy in the Core Strategy. Priority at settlement level will firstly be to previously developed land and buildings within the settlement, other suitable infill sites, then key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement. It is evident from the Site Assessments for the Outer South East MCA that limited opportunities exist to meet the housing requirement without looking to sustainable greenfield extension sites. In acknowledgement of the District's development needs and the overall spatial development strategy a selective review of the Green Belt is being undertaken. We have supported this approach in the emerging Core Strategy and present in this representation justification for why a sustainable extension of Garforth at Sturton Grange would have the least impact on Green Belt purposes.

# General Comments

Name: C Makin

Representor No: PRS06414

Representation ID: REP08068

Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Core Strategy Spatial Policy 1 promotes economic prosperity, job retention and opportunities for growth in key strategic locations for job growth. Garforth is identified as a key strategic location where sites of 15ha+/providing 1000 jobs+ are needed to deliver the Core Strategy's vision. The Draft Site Allocations Plan identifies sufficient committed employment sites at the Major Settlement of Garforth to achieve the spatial objectives of the Core Strategy. We support the allocation of these 'lime green' sites in support of this strategic objective. It is important to acknowledge that housing growth has a key role in delivering future development to support economic activity. Leeds City Council should seek co-ordinate development requirements by maximising opportunities to secure high levels of accessibility and sustainability at Garforth as a key strategic location for job growth. Land at East Garforth is ideally placed to support growth at the strategic employment sites concentrated at the north of the settlement.

We note that site CFSM028 (Land north of Garforth) is assessed as 'green' for industrial uses. The Site Assessment for the same site, however, identifies the site as amber and flags a number of physical and environmental constraints. We strongly consider that site 2156 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt. The northern edge of Garforth is defined by impermeable built form at Lotherton Way Industrial Estate which provides a good existing barrier between the urban area and undeveloped land to the north. The site provides footpath circuits and links, including linking to the Leeds Country Way, pedestrian tunnels beneath the M1 and Hawk's Nest Wood. The topography of the land to the south of the motorway results in open views north across the site. Further to the above we strongly consider that the access constraints (i.e. Barwick Road) would be likely to inhibit the site from being able to Demonstrate developability or viability. It is noted that the Council's Highway department do not support the site. We would also query the following matters in terms of being able to demonstrate developability:

- The site is not supported by ecology stakeholders - parts of site are sufficient to be designated Local Wildlife Site and the site is adjacent to a Leeds Nature Area (Hawk's Nest Wood)
- It is expected that the planned route of HS2 will impact upon the developability of the northern portion of the site.
- Land stability – reclamation of opencast mine. The Council must be satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect that the site is available. A site is considered available where there is confidence that there are no legal ownership problems such as multiple ownerships or ransom strips or operational requirements of landowners.

Representation ID: REP08071

Question Ref: General comment

Retail

Pegasus recognise the important service role of the city's shopping centres and supports the principle of, where needed, accommodating new retail development.

Representation ID: REP08073

Question Ref: G2

Greenspace

The provision of greenspace in a local area should be based on qualitative as well as quantitative considerations. We do not object to changing the typology of greenspaces where there is robust and up-to-date evidence to demonstrate that such action is necessary and suitable.

Representation ID: REP08073

Question Ref: G3

Greenspace

Access to open spaces and opportunities for sport, 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. Leeds City Council should therefore give careful consideration to this policy framework prior to identifying housing allocations on greenspace sites identified through the Green Space Audit.

Representation ID: REP08073

Question Ref: G4

Greenspace

We agree with the principle that resources from chargeable development can be used towards infrastructure that is needed as a result of development, and that this may include improving the quality of existing greenspace in suitable locations. Core Strategy Policy G4 provides a mechanism for safeguarding and improving existing greenspace in those areas which have adequate supply. This will enable the local authority to address qualitative deficiencies.

Representation ID: REP08073

Question Ref: G6

Greenspace

We agree that new greenspace should be provided in areas that fall below accessibility distance standards to ensure residents have adequate access to different types of greenspace.

Representation ID: REP08073

Question Ref: G8

Greenspace

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.

Kennett Lane Meadows is a Local Nature Area and serves an important role as a wildlife corridor. It is therefore important that this greenspace is safeguarded and improved. Site 1004 should be retained as greenspace.

# General Comments

**Name: R Kemp**

**Representor No: PRS06419**

Representation ID: REP07476      Question Ref: H10

Housing

## Introduction

On behalf of Mr Rory Kemp, George F. White has been commissioned to prepare and submit this report to Leeds City Council promoting an area of land located at Calverley Lane near Horsforth for allocation in the forthcoming Site Allocation Plan element of the emerging Leeds Local Plan. Mr Kemp is the owner of the land.

Leeds City Council is currently in the process of preparing a Local Plan and has published its Preferred Sites Document for a period of public consultation which closes on the 29th July. The Council has confirmed that there is presently an opportunity for sites which have not previously been considered to come forward for consideration through the Local Plan process. It is the Council's intention to publish a draft version of the Local Plan in Summer 2014 with a view to adoption of the Plan by the end of 2015.

We request that the Council consider the merits of the land in question with a view towards allocating it for residential development in the forthcoming Local Plan.

## 2.0 Site Description

The 'Land at Calverley Lane, Horsforth' is a 3.66 hectare site comprising agricultural land and woodland, lying to the south west of Horsforth alongside the A6120 (Broadway).

Positioned to the north west of Leeds within the Leeds Green Belt, the land is enclosed on three sides by heavy tree cover and on the fourth, northern edge, by Calverley Lane. Beyond this is open countryside. To the south eastern side of the A6120 is 'Park Lane College' as well as a cemetery and a housing estate. A large roundabout lies to the north of the site.

According to the Environment Agency Flood Map, the land is not within a Flood Risk area. The site is within the Green Belt.

On the basis of information available on the Council's website and to the knowledge of the site's owners, the site at Calverley Lane, Horsforth has not been previously been promoted for allocation to Leeds City Council.

## Planning Policy

The site is allocated as Green Belt in the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan 2006 Review. It is also within a designated Special Landscape Area. We have provided an extract of the Proposals Map below for reference.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that Green Belt serves five purposes:

- 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.

Image 2: Extract Proposals Map 2006 Leeds UDP

Site Assessment

Sustainability and Other Issues

This site offers excellent sustainability with high quality road and transport links and accessibility to facilities in Horsforth town centre. In public transport terms, the site is served by the 8, 8a and 9 bus routes which offer regular services to and from Pudsey, Moortown, Seacroft and Horsforth. Just over 100 metres from the site (on Rawdon Rd.) is a bus stop served by the 33, 33a and 757 routes. The 33 and 33a provide frequent services to and from Leeds City Centre and the 757 provides a public transport link to Leeds Bradford International Airport. The site is also just over 2 km from Horsforth Rail Station which offers regular services to and from Leeds city centre.

The site benefits from excellent tree cover along its boundary, in particular along the A6120/Broadway. The site also possesses a very well defined boundary with the A6120 and Calverley Lane forming the boundary to two sides and the sites trees and hedges creating a well defined boundary on the remaining side.

The site is not within a Flood Risk Zone, does not contain any Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings nor is it in close proximity to a Conservation Area. We would anticipate that the site would be accessed via Calverley Lane as opposed to the A6120.

Green Belt

We have considered the site's merits in terms of impact on the Green Belt in

# General Comments

---

**Name:** R Kemp

**Representor No:** PRS06419

accordance with Leeds City Council's Green Belt Review Methodology Document. For convenience we have provided our findings below in table format.

[See representation submitted for full table]

We conclude therefore that the development of the site:

- has a low potential to lead to urban sprawl;
- would not significantly reduce the gap between settlements;
- would not result in significant encroachment on the countryside; and
- would not harm the setting or character of any heritage asset or historic town.

Conclusion

We respectfully request therefore that Leeds City Council has due regard to the content of this submission and consider the merits of allocating the site at Calverley Lane for residential development.

The development of this sustainably located site would not weaken the Green Belt or conflict with its key purposes.

Site Plan attached

See also representation submitted for full details

# General Comments

**Name: John Benson Penny**

**Representor No: PRS06428**

Representation ID: REP07494      Question Ref: H10

Housing

## Introduction

On behalf of Mr John Benson Penny, George F. White has been commissioned to prepare and submit representations to Leeds City Council promoting an area of land located at New York Lane, Rawdon for allocation in the forthcoming Site Allocation Plan element of the emerging Leeds Local Plan. Mr JB Penny is the owner of the land.

Leeds City Council is currently in the process of preparing a Local Plan and has published its Preferred Sites Document for a period of public consultation which closes on the 29th July 2013. The Council has confirmed that there is presently an opportunity for sites which have not previously been considered to come forward for consideration through the Local Plan process. It is the Council's intention to publish a draft version of the Local Plan in Summer 2014 with a view to adoption of the Plan by the end of 2015.

We request that the Council consider the merits of the land in question with a view towards allocating it for residential development in the forthcoming Local Plan.

## Site Description

'Land at New York Lane, Rawdon' is a 4.49 hectare piece of agricultural land to the south east of Rawdon and west of Horsforth. The site is in agricultural use at present and is bounded to the north by New York Lane, to the south by Woodlands Drive, to the west by a hedge (beyond which lies open countryside) and to the east in part by residential development.

To the north, on the other side of New York Lane lies an air-conditioning plant. The Leeds Country Way runs along the northern boundary of the site before turning and running south along the western boundary through the belt of trees.

The nearest listed building is Woodleigh Hall which lies to the south east of the site. Woodleigh Hall is a Grade II listed building.

According to the Environment Agency Flood Map, the land is not within a Flood Risk area. The site is within the Green Belt.

On the basis of information available on the Council's website and to the knowledge of the site's owners, the site at New York Lane has not been previously been promoted for allocation to Leeds City Council.

Image 1 below is a Site Location Plan. We request that the Council consider this site for allocation firstly as a whole and secondly, if the whole site is unacceptable, then consider the northern area of the site which is shown hatched on the plan below. The hatched area of the site comprises 1.8 ha.

Image 1: Site Location Plan: Land at New York Lane

## Planning Policy

The site is allocated as Green Belt in the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan 2006 Review. It is also within a designated Special Landscape Area. We have provided an extract of the Proposals Map below for reference.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that Green Belt serves five purposes:

- 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.

Image 2: Extract Proposals Map 2006 Leeds UDP

## Site Assessment

### Sustainability and Other Issues

In sustainability terms the site benefits from road and transport links and excellent accessibility to facilities in Rawdon, Yeadon and Horsforth town centre. In public transport terms, the site is served by the 33 and 33a bus routes which connect Leeds and Otley. The site is also just over 2 m from Horsforth Rail Station which offers regular services to and from Leeds city centre.

# General Comments

---

**Name: John Benson Penny**

**Representor No: PRS06428**

The site is not within a Flood Risk Zone, does not contain any Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings nor is it in close proximity to a Conservation Area.

We would anticipate that the site could be accessed via Southlands Avenue, Knott Lane or New York Lane.  
Green Belt

We have considered the site's merits in terms of impact on the Green Belt in accordance with Leeds City Council's Green Belt Review Methodology Document. For convenience we have provided our findings below in table format.

[See representation submitted for full table]

We conclude therefore that the development of the site:

- has a low potential to lead to urban sprawl;
- would not significantly reduce the gap between settlements;
- would not result in significant encroachment on the countryside; and
- would not harm the setting or character of any heritage asset or historic town.

Conclusion

We respectfully request therefore that Leeds City Council has due regard to the content of this submission and consider the merits of allocating the site at New York Lane either as a whole or just the northern element of the site for residential development.

The development of this sustainably located site would not weaken the Green Belt or conflict with its key purposes.

See also representation submitted for full details

Site Plan attached

---

**Name: Brenda Lancaster**

**Representor No: PRS06430**

Representation ID: REP07499

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

I am writing on behalf of members of the Mean wood Valley Partnership group and ask that you extend the first consultation period which ends on Monday 29th July at 5.00pm. We have hardly had time to digest this information regarding a much loved site, The Paddock off Church Lane, as well as other nearby proposals.

The Meanwood Valley Partnership was set up to protect our local green space and we work in partnership with Parks and Countryside officers. Mean wood Residents take an active interest in where they live and fully engage in local issues working with Leeds City Council Officers to resolve disputes and decisions eg. The huge development on the Woodleas off Tongue Lane (former Mean wood Park Hospital Site) and most recently the new Waitrose Store.

I have just found my copy of the Meanwood Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan - approved as material consideration in the determination of planning decisions - 8th December 2008. Quote- 'Meanwood is a place of special character and historic interest. This appraisal and

management plan sets out the features that contribute to its distinctiveness and identifies opportunities for its protection and enhancement'.

That appraisal took lots of meetings and involvement from local people. Why then when local people give their time to be involved and being interested in where they live are they presented with a 'hurried' consultation? It is very short notice for people to respond.

Suspensions are rife in the area that we are being informed and any decisions will be rushed through.

---

**Name: Anna McLaughlin**

**Representor No: PRS06432**

Representation ID: REP07504

Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

Provision of play area will be invaluable in the village.

---

**Name: Trustees Of The Diocese Of Leeds**

**Representor No: PRS06445**

Representation ID: REP07526

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This representation requests that landowners of SHLAA site options and the wider community in Leeds be consulted further on preferred site options for the Site Allocations Plan if the strategy's approach to housing allocation changes when the Leeds Core Strategy is adopted.

# General Comments

Name: Justin Coley

Representor No: PRS06448

Representation ID: REP07524 Question Ref: H11

Housing

## Phasing

The CVRA would prefer that Brownfield sites that do not bring community benefit are given the greatest consideration and priority for residential development.

In view of this, the CVRA recommends that the sites we believe to be appropriate for development should be developed in the following order:

- 1) Proposed Brownfield site off A61 Leeds Road and South of West Beck (Appendix D)
- 2) Proposed Brownfield site South of Ouzlewell Green and off the B6135, currently occupied by industrial units (edged in yellow at Appendix C); leaving a means of access for:
- 3) SAP Site 1261
- 4) A smaller scale development of SAP site 3085 providing that
  - a. The means of access is directly from Leeds Road;
  - b. Any development is only along the sides of the field adjoining Leeds Road and Jumbles Lane; and
  - c. The island of trees within the field remains untouched.

Representation ID: REP07524 Question Ref: H12

Housing

## Traveller Sites

The sites detailed in 'Phasing' above all enhance and consolidate existing neighbourhoods and none are suitable for use as Traveller Sites.

Representation ID: REP07524 Question Ref: H14

Housing

## Elderly Accommodation

We recommend that a proportion of dwellings on each site must be either bungalows or other dwellings that are suitable for use as residences by the elderly or infirm.

Representation ID: REP07524 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

The following documents submitted on behalf of the Carlton Village Residents Association ('CVRA'):

- Completed Leeds Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options Response Form
  - CVRA Response to Leeds City Council Site Allocations Plan Consultation
  - Copy of CVRA Constitution as a Neighbourhood Forum, signed by 41 member
- (See scanned PDFs for these documents)

## RESPONSE TO LEEDS CITY COUNCIL SITE ALLOCATION CONSULTATION

This document details the considered response by the Carlton Village Residents Association ('CVRA') to the Leeds City Council Site Allocations Plan ('SAP') consultation process.

### BACKGROUND

Carlton Village is a small village located in '8 Outer South', that was included in the 1086 Doomsday Book as 'Carlentine' and has existed as a village for nearly a Millennium.

The Village has a rich agricultural heritage and our rhubarb growing has been featured on many TV programs by celebrity chefs including Rick Stein, Marco Pierre-White and Gregg Wallace. In February 2010, 'Yorkshire Forced Rhubarb' was added to the list of foods and drinks that have their names legally protected by the European Commission's Protected Food Name scheme and was awarded Protected Designation of Origin status (PDO) in February 2010.

Carlton Village is represented as a community by the CVRA, which is in the process of applying for Neighbourhood Forum status.

### CONSIDERED RESPONSE

The CVRA has considered each of the SAP sites within their Boundary, and also a SAP site beyond (1261) that they believe would benefit from reconsideration.

They have also detailed two additional areas of land that are brownfield sites and they would like to be considered for residential housing development.

Appendix A - Details the Weighted Criteria Based Scores that CVRA has given to each of the SAP sites within their Neighbourhood Boundary and also for a single SAP site beyond this.

Appendix B - Provides CVRA Commentary and Additional Considerations for each of the SAP sites detailed in Appendix A.

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.

Appendix D - Details an industrial estate on the A61 Leeds Road, South of the West Beck that the CVRA asks the Council to consider for use as a Brownfield site for residential development and is currently occupied by industrial units.

### ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

#### Schooling

The CVRA is concerned that there is inadequate schooling available in the area to cater for any significant sized developments.

Representation ID: REP07530 Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

## Greenspace Allocations

At Appendix E the CVRA has detailed three areas that it would like designating as Greenspace to reflect their existing use. (see scanned document for location)

"Far Green" maintained by CRVA in Bloom Group (corner of Main Street and Stainton Lane).

Main Street - area of community use for sport, pastimes, leisure, events and carparking.

Existing allotments (corner of Town Street and Unity Street).



# General Comments

---

**Name: Victoria Harrison**

**Representor No: PRS06449**

Representation ID: REP07532      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: James Rendall**

**Representor No: PRS06450**

Representation ID: REP07533      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Rachel Spode**

**Representor No: PRS06451**

Representation ID: REP07534      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jasmine Hazlewood**

**Representor No: PRS06452**

Representation ID: REP07535      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Louise Camp**

**Representor No: PRS06453**

Representation ID: REP07536      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Graham Hannam**

**Representor No: PRS06454**

Representation ID: REP07538      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Charlotte Stubbs**

**Representor No: PRS06455**

Representation ID: REP07539      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Daniel Read**

**Representor No: PRS06456**

Representation ID: REP07540      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Benjamin Garnett**

**Representor No: PRS06457**

Representation ID: REP07541      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Sally Ramsey**

**Representor No: PRS06458**

Representation ID: REP07542      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jean Storey**

**Representor No: PRS06459**

Representation ID: REP07543      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Cherie Muscroft**

**Representor No: PRS06460**

Representation ID: REP07544      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Cathie Metcalfe**

**Representor No: PRS06461**

Representation ID: REP07545      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Please find FPI SHLAA site submission form and location plans attached for Newtown Farm, Micklefield, LS25 4DD Currently in green belt land and not highlighted as a site to be considered in the 2013 Leeds Planning review even though previous submissions have been made. The site is not ruled out for consideration either, simply not referenced.

[NB This is a SHLAA submission, but as reference made to 'review' and previous submissions, included as representation to site allocations plan]

---

**Name: Janet Colgan**

**Representor No: PRS06462**

Representation ID: REP07547      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Louise Rowling**

**Representor No: PRS06463**

Representation ID: REP07549      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: James Hardy**

**Representor No: PRS06464**

Representation ID: REP07548      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Julie Glyde**

**Representor No: PRS06465**

Representation ID: REP07550      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Glenys Riddell**

**Representor No: PRS06466**

Representation ID: REP07551      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jennifer Read**

**Representor No: PRS06467**

Representation ID: REP07552      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Rachael Booth**

**Representor No: PRS06468**

Representation ID: REP07553      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Tam Tat**

**Representor No: PRS06469**

Representation ID: REP07554      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Kat Robinson**

**Representor No: PRS06470**

Representation ID: REP07555      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Ellie Lyon**

**Representor No: PRS06471**

Representation ID: REP07598      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Phoebe Tate**

**Representor No: PRS06472**

Representation ID: REP07599      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Gary Stevens**

**Representor No: PRS06473**

Representation ID: REP07600      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Chris Robson**

**Representor No: PRS06474**

Representation ID: REP07602      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Clare Bancroft**

**Representor No: PRS06475**

Representation ID: REP07604      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Lindsa Roberts**

**Representor No: PRS06477**

Representation ID: REP07605      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Rosie Barab**

**Representor No: PRS06479**

Representation ID: REP07611      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Amanda Hare**

**Representor No: PRS06481**

Representation ID: REP07612      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Park Lane Homes & Dg Fryer, N Joyce, B Timms, P Joyce, M Joyce

**Representor No:** PRS06483

Representation ID: REP07613      Question Ref: H3

Housing

It is the basis of this representation that the Council should support the allocation of the land at Wike Ridge Lane, Slaid Hill.

The specific case for supporting this site will be made as a direct response to question H10

---

**Name:** Liz Rymer

**Representor No:** PRS06484

Representation ID: REP07616      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Len Harvey

**Representor No:** PRS06485

Representation ID: REP07617      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** David Knaggs

**Representor No:** PRS06486

Representation ID: REP07618      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Kirsty Drakes

**Representor No:** PRS06487

Representation ID: REP07619      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Lucy Scott

**Representor No:** PRS06488

Representation ID: REP07620      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

**Name:** Mark E.n. Harrison

**Representor No:** PRS06490

Representation ID: REP07607      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THE LEEDS LDF SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN – ISSUES AND OPTIONS

The comments and/or changes which the Coal Authority would like to make or see in relation to the above document are:

Representation No.1: Coal Resources and Mining Legacy

Comment – The Coal Authority is satisfied that the emerging Core Strategy and adopted Natural Resources and Waste DPD contain specific policies that address our objectives regarding safeguarding surface coal resources and unstable land resulting from past mining activities. However, both of these issues have implications for the allocation of land for new development and we recommend that coal resources and mining legacy are afforded due consideration as part of the site allocation process.

In terms of assessing potential sites for allocation it would therefore be prudent to include a criterion which assesses coal mining data. In accordance with NPPF guidance (paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and 166), this would be a due diligence check to ensure that potential development sites do not contain any mine entries or other coal related hazards which would require remediation or stabilisation prior to development.

However, I would emphasise that former mining activities and related hazards are certainly not a strict constraint on development; indeed it would be far preferable for appropriate development to take place in order to remove these public liabilities on the general tax payer. The Coal Authority would therefore not wish to suggest that any potential sites should be excluded from the assessment on the grounds of former mining legacy issues.

In addition, an assessment should be made of the likely impact on mineral resources, including coal. This will help to ensure that any potential sterilisation effects (along with whether prior extraction of the resource would be appropriate) are properly considered in line with the guidance in paragraphs 143 and 144 of the NPPF.

Reason – In order to ensure that the presence of surface coal resources and/or the legacy of past mining activity is afforded due consideration as part of the site allocations process.

## CONCLUSION

The Coal Authority welcomes the opportunity to make these early comments. We are, of course, willing to discuss the comments made above in further detail if desired and would be happy to negotiate alternative suitable wording to address any of our concerns. The Coal Authority also wishes to continue to be consulted both informally if required and formally on future stages. The Coal Authority would be happy to enter into discussions ahead of any examination hearing process to try and reach a negotiated position if this were considered helpful.

[See Scanned document for full background information on the role of the Coal Authority]

Representation ID: REP07607      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

## COMMENTS ON THE LEEDS LDF SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN – ISSUES AND OPTIONS

### Surface Coal Resources and Prior Extraction

As you will be aware, the Leeds City Council area contains coal resources which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations. Information on these resources is available to Mineral Planning Authorities free of charge from the Coal Authority following signing a data sharing licence and was given to Leeds City Council in December 2009.

The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unnecessarily sterilised by new development. Where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process. Contact details for individual operators that may be able to assist with coal extraction in advance of development can be obtained from the Confederation of Coal Producers' website at [www.coalpro.co.uk/members.shtml](http://www.coalpro.co.uk/members.shtml).

As the Coal Authority owns the coal on behalf of the state, if a development is to intersect the ground then specific written permission of the Coal Authority may be required.

Coal Mining Legacy - As you will be aware, the Leeds City Council area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities.

Problems can include collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases, incidents of spontaneous combustion, and the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found in any coal mining area, particularly where coal exists near to the surface, including existing residential areas. The Planning Department at the Coal Authority was created in 2008 to lead the work on defining areas where these legacy issues may occur.

The Coal Authority has records of over 171,000 coal mine entries across the coalfields, although there are thought to be many more unrecorded. Shallow coal which is present near the surface can give rise to stability, gas and potential spontaneous combustion problems. Even in areas where coal mining was deep, in some geological conditions cracks or fissures can appear at the surface. It is estimated that as many as 2 million of the 7.7 million properties across the coalfields may lie in areas with the potential to be affected by these problems. In our view, the planning processes in coalfield areas need to take account of coal mining legacy issues.

Within the Leeds City Council area there are approximately 2,800 recorded mine entries and around 38 coal mining related hazards have been reported to the Coal Authority. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by Planning Authorities to ensure that site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards. Although mining legacy occurs as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.

As the Coal Authority owns the coal and coal mine entries on behalf of the state, if a development is to intersect the ground then specific written permission of the Coal Authority may be required.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Briony Spandler**

**Representor No: PRS06491**

Representation ID: REP07623      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Anthony Oates**

**Representor No: PRS06492**

Representation ID: REP07624      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: David Thompson**

**Representor No: PRS06493**

Representation ID: REP07626      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Chris Bancroft**

**Representor No: PRS06494**

Representation ID: REP07627      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Carolyn Tonks**

**Representor No: PRS06495**

Representation ID: REP07628      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Katherine Pittendreigh-walker**

**Representor No: PRS06496**

Representation ID: REP07629      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Edward Battye**

**Representor No: PRS06497**

Representation ID: REP07631      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Lisa Coupland**

**Representor No: PRS06498**

Representation ID: REP07632      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Roxanne Newsome**

**Representor No: PRS06499**

Representation ID: REP07634      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Anita Seals**

**Representor No: PRS06501**

Representation ID: REP07635      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Joanne Southam**

**Representor No: PRS06502**

Representation ID: REP07636      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Holly Lister**

**Representor No: PRS06503**

Representation ID: REP07637      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Matt Wilde**

**Representor No: PRS06504**

Representation ID: REP07638      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Debra Mackney**

**Representor No: PRS06505**

Representation ID: REP07640      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Kirsty Touse**

**Representor No: PRS06506**

Representation ID: REP07641      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Sarah Kelly**

**Representor No: PRS06507**

Representation ID: REP07642      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.



# General Comments

---

**Name: Anne-marie Robson**

**Representor No: PRS06508**

Representation ID: REP07643      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Rachel Steer**

**Representor No: PRS06509**

Representation ID: REP07644      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Paul Jemison**

**Representor No: PRS06510**

Representation ID: REP07645      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Louise Rix**

**Representor No: PRS06511**

Representation ID: REP07646      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Charlotte Moon**

**Representor No: PRS06512**

Representation ID: REP07648      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Louise Denton**

**Representor No: PRS06513**

Representation ID: REP07649      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Neil Martin**

**Representor No: PRS06514**

Representation ID: REP07658      Question Ref: R3

Retail

CFSM021/REF 1044

Drainage: We all know about recent flooding in Garforth and the works having been carried out to prevent it, however it is insufficient if fields are removed which soak up the rain. Farmland is important to these flooding plans.

Roads/congestion: the road infrastructure in and around the area is totally insufficient to cope with the amount of extra vehicles these houses will produce. Congestion at the top of Main Street, Lidgett Lane, 'Old George Roundabout' is already gridlocked and this will make things a great deal worse. Trains are also insufficient at current levels and are already overcrowded.

Footfall: the most direct route from the proposed site to Main Street is via Coupland Road. This will invade privacy, increase noise levels, etc along the street and could invoke more problems and violence.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Joe Sykes**

**Representor No: PRS06515**

Representation ID: REP07650      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Janet Myers**

**Representor No: PRS06516**

Representation ID: REP07651      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Phil Fillpiak**

**Representor No: PRS06517**

Representation ID: REP07653      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Vonney Armstrong**

**Representor No: PRS06518**

Representation ID: REP07654      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Wetherby Park Ltd**

**Representor No: PRS06520**

Representation ID: REP05581      Question Ref: R3

Retail

PLAN ISSUES AND OPTIONS — LAND AT SANDBECK LANE, WETHERBY, LS23

We are instructed by Wetherby Park Limited to make formal representations to the Leeds Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options document and in particular in relation to the company's land holding off Sandbeck Lane in Wetherby which is within Area 6, the Outer North East.

Representations were submitted on the 30th March 2012 by Asda Stores Ltd as part of the "Call for Sites" initiative, the site subsequently being referenced CFSR005. The representation sought to advise the Council of the intention to promote a planning application for the erection of a supermarket and associated infrastructure on the site and, as part of the Call for Sites initiative, the site was thus assessed for its potential to accommodate retail development. Subsequent to these representations, although the planning application was refused, further work is being undertaken to review the reasons for refusal with a view to progressing this project further. In response to the questions on retail issues and options pursuant to the Outer North East Area, particular reference is made to questions R3 and R4 and the following comments are made: - "R3 — Do you have any comments on the "Call for Sites" sites coming forward for retail uses within the Plan period?"

As set out in paragraph 6.2.4 of the Issues and Options document, seemingly the site has been rejected as a potential for retail development as it is not currently served by public transport and therefore deemed to be sequentially inappropriate. It is recognised the site is on the edge of the urban area and as part of the planning application, detailed evidence was presented as regards the ability of the site to link with the town centre and it is maintained there is evidence to suggest the site will be served by public transport as and when development of this site takes place. It is therefore maintained the site should not be rejected at this stage for retailing and ongoing dialogue should be maintained with the landowner to ensure a consistent and flexible approach is taken to considering retail sites. This brings us on to question 4 which states: -

---

**Name: Kevin Lycett**

**Representor No: PRS06521**

Representation ID: REP07655      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Katrina Robinson**

**Representor No: PRS06522**

Representation ID: REP07656      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Dan Williamson**

**Representor No: PRS06523**

Representation ID: REP07659      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Richard Anderson**

**Representor No: PRS06525**

Representation ID: REP07661      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Site Allocations DPD- 39 Stanningly Road, Leeds regarding the above property and DPD I submit a representation relating to land owned by the Ministry of Justice (MoJ). Consultation documents

Various consultation documents have been reviewed relating to this area. These include the General and Inner Area consultation boards which firstly point out your Authority's need to provide land for housing and secondly identify such land. It also requests that sites which could be developed in the short to medium term be brought to your attention. As this site has not been identified before we take this opportunity to do so. For your assistance additional information is provided below.

The Site - This 2.1 ha of land identified on the enclosed plan [SEE SCANNED DOCUMENT] is owned by the MoJ and in the past was used by the Prison Service for Main Stores where material was held prior to being specifically required within the prison. With those uses having been moved to premises next to the prison itself this land will shortly be surplus to requirements.

To the north of the site across Stanningly Road lies Armley Park whilst to the west lies The Yorkshire Tile retail and warehousing facility. To the east sits Winker Green Mills, recently converted into residential use alongside additional new homes while to the south sits the 12 storey Brunzell Gardens apartment block.

Land adjacent- On the south western boundary of our property lies a 1.32 ha site which, on 8th March 2013, was granted planning permission for Ideal Care Homes to develop a 3 storey care home, 46 affordable homes and flats and associated infrastructure/landscaping.

Planning Policy - With no site specific planning policies applying to this site (on either the adopted 2006 UDP or the emerging Core Strategy) this site can be viewed as "white land." As the site is not specifically allocated for housing (under policies H3 or H4 of the draft UDP) policy H8 applies. Here proposals will be supported by the Council where it is a natural infill compatible with its locality, existing or proposed infrastructure is satisfactory and they would not conflict with recreation/greenspace policies.

Discussions with planning officers - I spoke with the case officer (name deleted) for adjoining Ideal Care Homes proposal in February and July 2013; this was pre and post determination of the application. On both occasions he believed that, in principle, residential re-use of the site could be appropriate

noting that potential land contamination and height (proximity to the listed converted warehouses) would require careful consideration.

(name deleted), in July 2013, suggested that should the MoJ wish to cover all avenues submission of a representation may be appropriate. As MoJ are not a residential developer and as our complete exit from the site has still to take place we consider it appropriate to submit this representation.

Assessment - With Prison Service use of the site now ending and with the site surrounded on 3 sides by residential development we believe in visual and townscape terms a residential re-use of this site to be appropriate. When assessed against planning policy it is clear that whilst no residential (or indeed other land use) allocation has been made, policy H8 firmly supports residential development. This is borne out when examining the circumstances (and planning officer's committee report) when the adjacent Ideal Care Homes development was granted planning permission 4 months ago.

We believe that policy H8 alongside the precedent set by the adjacent Ideal Care Homes development recently granted permission sets a positive determination framework should a planning application be submitted. However we wish to provide increased certainty that this is appropriate through this Site Allocations DPD consultation route/process.

Specific draft DPD question

Page 23 of the DPD document asks the following question:

"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."

The answer to this question, with the contents of this letter and attachments is yes.

The same page asks the question:

"Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term?"

The answer to this question is, short term, 0-5 years.

Without Prejudice Should MoJ, or any future land owner be in a position to move forward with a planning application for the site, we do not wish the submission of these representations to have any bearing on the consideration and determination of the said application.

I trust you find sufficient material in this representation to advocate a residential allocation.

Should you require any further information please contact me.

---

Representation ID: REP07661      Question Ref: H11

Housing

"Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term?"

The answer to this question is, short term, 0-5 years.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Fryer, Joyce, Timms, Joyce, Joyce**

**Representor No: PRS06526**

Representation ID: REP07668      Question Ref: H10

Housing

REPRESENTATIONS WITH REFERENCE TO LAND TO THE EAST OF WIKE RIDGE LANE, SLAID HILL, LEEDS

Please find enclosed one copy of the representations made in connection with the Site Allocations Issues and Options Paper with specific reference to the land to the east of Wike Ridge Lane, Slaid Hill, Leeds. I also enclose one copy of the completed response form which refers to the enclosed submitted document.

We trust the enclosed document will be taken into account as part of the preparation of the next stage of the Site Allocations DPD. If it would assist your consideration of the representations to meet and discuss our client's proposed land or if you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Site Plan attached

---

**Name: Palmer Nurseries, Rodley**

**Representor No: PRS06527**

Representation ID: REP07733      Question Ref: H10

Housing

New Site

This potential development site is located off Calverley Lane, Rodley/Farsley and extends to approximately 4.8ha. The site is currently in the Green Belt in the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006). The site is triangular in shape, and is bound to the east by the A6120, Farsely Ring Road. To the north of the site is Brookfield recreation ground and to the south and west across Calverley Lane are some large detached dwellings set in extensive grounds and fields.

## Conclusions

The sustainability plan shows that this site is in an accessible location, on the edge of the Main Urban Area where the majority of growth is encouraged via the emerging LDF. The development masterplan highlights that the site can deliver over 100 dwellings. The site is in the Outer West housing market area which has a housing requirement of 4,700 dwellings, a significant proportion of the overall housing requirement.

This site is an ideal candidate for a residential allocation as it is brownfield land which offers a logical extension to the existing urban form. The development of brownfield land is preferable to the development of greenfield sites and should be considered first. The site does not currently contribute to Green Belt purposes and does not have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. It is well screened by existing trees, planting and landscaping and therefore is not visible from the highway. The site is deliverable as shown on the development Masterplan. It is controlled by a landowner who is willing to develop and is therefore available. The site also has no major physical constraints to development, is located within a strong market area and is therefore development is achievable.

Site Plan Attached

---

**Name: Jon Mayor**

**Representor No: PRS06529**

Representation ID: REP07737      Question Ref: E5

Employment

Leeds Bradford International Airport

We welcome the council's initial thoughts on the potential for developing a wider hub of economic activities at the airport, and there is the opportunity to be ambitious and set out a clear framework to capitalise on the benefits the growth of the airport could bring to help the City and City Region deliver its key economic objectives. The vast majority of the land identified in the Site Allocations Issues and Options draft as locations for employment development is already in use, some for airport related development, or employment use. It is therefore difficult to see how much of this land will assist in creating the high quality mixed use gateway to the airport that is required if its to meet modern expectations, raise the profile of the City, and attract new inward investment. The largest area identified for employment use is the Sentinel site, however it accommodates 2, 000 airport car parking spaces and whilst there remains an extant permission for other development, there appears not to be any intent to redevelop the site and there is no reason to expect that position to change in the future. Furthermore, it is some distance from the airport, and there are other locations closer to the airport where commercial development should take place first, much better related to the existing airport operations and current and proposed surface access connections. The Avro site is also identified for employment use, but the site is covered by one building and associated space used primarily for storage and distribution purposes. There will no doubt continue to be a market for the building, but it won't satisfy the range of business needs, such as offices and hotels that you would expect to be attracted to a growing airport. Whilst not dismissing the role that existing employment sites may play, the opportunity to develop a new airport hub requires a much broader review of the land assets around the airport, in order to provide the right planning environment to secure new development that is integrated with the airport and future surface access improvements and supports the objective of creating a successful and vibrant airport hub. The architectural drawings included in the representations set out some thoughts on how this could come forward. LBIA welcome the opportunity to continue to work closely with the City Council and key stakeholders in the region and local communities in developing that opportunity and in doing so ensuring that planning, economic, and transport policy and strategy is fully aligned and supportive.

See also representation submitted for full details

# General Comments

**Name:** Andrew Scott

**Representor No:** PRS06531

Representation ID: REP07738      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

I make the initial comment that there is no mention of an increase in public amenities, ie re-open Rawdon Library, GP surgeries, dentists, etc. or other civic amenities, ie Yeadon Town Hall - why not enlarge? Public amenities have not increased in the last 25 years.

**Name:** Dorothy Hogan

**Representor No:** PRS06533

Representation ID: REP07741      Question Ref: H12      Housing

Barwick in Elmet  
There are no suitable sites in this area for this kind of accommodation.

# General Comments

**Name: Mr And Mrs Cooke, The Singh**

**Representor No: PRS06534**

Representation ID: REP07745      Question Ref: H10

Housing

COMMENTS ON THE LEEDS CITY COUNCIL ISSUES AND OPTIONS DRAFT SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT ('Site Allocations DPD') CONSULTATION - 3RD JUNE 2013 UNTIL 29th JULY 2013 – LAND EAST OF OTLEY ROAD, ADEL, LEEDS – MADE ON BEHALF OF MR AND MRS COOKE, THE SINGH GILL FAMILY AND MR WALTON

## Introduction

We work on behalf of the land owners Mr and Mrs Cooke, the Singh Gill family and Mr Walton.

We have now had the opportunity to read the Site Allocations DPD and its associated evidence base and we have a number of comments.

We have set out our comments under the following headings:

- Background;
- The Site;
- The Historic Use;
- Proposed Residential Development;
- The Issues and Options Draft of the Site Allocations DPD;
- Our Assessment of the site - Land East of Otley Road, Adel, Leeds ('the Site')
- Conclusions

## Background

We hold the view that the proposed housing requirement is insufficient in terms of meeting the identified need. Furthermore the proposed requirement does not seek to address the housing backlog which has arisen from years of under provision within the District. Therefore it is our position that the housing requirement set out in the Core Strategy is insufficient. Leeds City Council has submitted the Core Strategy document for independent inspection and it is our view that the Inspector will require the Council to increase the proposed housing requirement. An increased housing requirement would have a knock on effect in that it will require additional land to be allocated across the District in the Site Allocations DPD.

If the housing requirement is increased as we advocate, the Council will have to allocate more land for development and this will include more amber sites and some sites currently identified as falling within the red category within the Site Allocations DPD.

On the basis of the above it is our view that the site in question should be allocated for development.

## The Site

The site is located between Otley Road (A630) and Church/Eccup Lane (Appendix 1). The western boundary of the site is largely formed by a dense tree belt which measures approximately 20 metres in width. Beyond the woodland belt there are currently some small fields and then there is the A160 Otley Road. To the north of the site is an area of mature woodland in which Adel Beck is located to the north. The eastern boundary of the site is formed by woodland, Church Lane and a cluster of residential properties and agricultural buildings. The southern boundary of the site is bound by a hedgerow, hedgerow trees and wooden fence. The area of agricultural land to the south of the site is identified within the Leeds UDP as a Protected Area of Search. We understand that a planning application is to be submitted on this land shortly. The site is therefore bounded to one side by existing urban land uses and to all others by a belt of trees.

the Site Allocations DPD as an amber PAS (Protected Area of Search) site which is capable of delivering 186 dwellings (ref: 2130 Church Lane, Adel). The site is therefore bounded on one side by existing urban land uses and will become further bound by development to the south following the realisation of site 2130.

## Proposed Residential Development

The development of the site would take design cues from the nearby residential development. It is proposed that the tree belt and hedges around the site are retained in order to screen the development within the locality and also maintain a natural buffer between the proposed built form and open agricultural land to the east of the site. It is proposed that areas of greenspace are integrated throughout the development to provide a graduation between the built up area and the agricultural land therefore ensuring that no harm is caused to the openness of the Green Belt.

An access road is proposed to be taken off of Otley Road, south of the agricultural holding. This stretch of Otley Road is relatively straight; as such no visibility issues are anticipated.

## The Issues and Options Draft of the Site Allocations DPD

The Site Allocations DPD contains an assessment for each site put forward for consideration as part of the allocations process. However the document does not inform the reader what weight is given to the criteria used in the assessment or show, other than indicatively, how each site that has been assessed has performed. The document does summarise and indicatively show the Councils views on each site. This is in the form of a brief written summary and a colour coded table which ranks the sites assessed into 3 broad categories.

The 3 broad categories are given a colour coding which is as follows:-

- Green – sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing.
- Amber – sites which have potential but there may be issues which need to be resolved, or the site may not be in such a favoured location as those highlighted in green.
- Red – sites which are not considered suitable for allocation for housing.

# General Comments

**Name: Mr And Mrs Cooke, The Singh**

**Representor No: PRS06534**

In addition to these categories there is a fourth category and this represents sites which were not considered suitable and therefore were not assessed. The site in question lies within the Outer-North West Housing Market Characteristic Area. The site has not previously been considered by the Site Allocations DPD or the SHLAA process. On this basis we have set out in the following section our assessment of the site. Our Assessment of the site

In this section of the letter we will assess the site in the context of its availability, achievability and suitability for housing development and as a result of this assessment we will conclude that there are no technical issues which would preclude the residential development of the site, that the site is sustainably located and that it is well related to the urban area of Adel and its associated infrastructure. Based on the assessment it will be demonstrated that the site should be allocated for residential development.

## Availability

The site is owned by Mr Cooke, the Singh Gill family and Mr Walton who all confirm that the site is available for development.

The land is therefore available for development.

## Achievable

This is a flat open greenfield site on the edge of the urban area of Leeds. It is therefore not contaminated and there are no topographical constraints. In recent years the site has been grazed and as such there is unlikely to be any ecological constraints which would preclude development.

The site can be accessed from either Otley Road or Church Lane. It is noted that an access from Otley Road would be more appropriate given the highway capacity concerns raised in respect of site 2130. Otley Road is long and straight with good visibility. Access is therefore capable of being achieved from Otley Road.

Part of the eastern fringe of the site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The proposed development would retain a buffer along the eastern boundary to ensure that the residential development would not have any impact upon the Flood Zones.

The SHLAA assessment for site 2130 sets out that this is a high market area and as such the site will be attractive to future occupiers and as such attractive to developers.

As far as we are aware there are no unusual or prohibitive development costs.

The development of the site is therefore undoubtedly achievable in that there are no known constraints to its prompt delivery and given that the site lies in a high market area it is clear that the site will be attractive to the house building industry and potential home owners.

## Suitability

There are a number of policy matters to consider here and these will be dealt with under the following headings:-

- The Principle of Growth in Adel;
- Sustainable development;
- Green Belt; and
- Flood Risk.

We will deal with each of the above matters in turn below.

### 1. The Principle of Growth in Adel

The Site Allocations DPD sets out that Outer North-West Housing Market Characteristic Area will need to provide land for 1,017 new dwellings over the plan period. The total capacity from green sites alone is 270 It is accepted by the Council that there is a need to allocate land in the Outer North-West area in order to meet the requirement. Housing growth will therefore be directed towards Adel.

### 2. Sustainable development

Otley Road is a subject to the national speed limit up to the Kingsley Drive T-junction.

Bus stops are located 115m west of the site along Otley Road providing frequent services to Ilkley, Otley, Skipton and Leeds City Centre. Clearly the site is within 400 metres of frequent bus services which provide access to jobs and services in other settlements.

Adel is located 7km north of Leeds City Centre and 15km south of Harrogate. Adel is identified within the Draft Core Strategy as a 'Lower Order Local Centre'. The shopping parade is location 650 metres south-west of the site on Otley Road. The parade comprises of a range of shops and services including a hairdressers, Natwest, Johnsons Dry Cleaners, estate agents, takeaways, Leeds Building Society, butchers, delicatessen, nursery, dentist, solicitors and opticians. The site therefore has access to local shops and services.

The nearest primary school is Adel St John The Baptist Primary School located 1.2km southeast of the site. The nearest secondary school is Ralph Thoresby High School located 1.4km south-west of the site. Access is therefore acceptable to educational facilities.

In terms of outdoor recreation and leisure facilities, Cookridge Hall Golf Club is located immediately to the west of Otley Road. The Golf Club facilities include a health and fitness centre. To the east of the site, beyond Church Lane, is Headingley Golf Club. Approximately 420 metres to the south of the site is Adel Sports Club. The sports club has a range of facilities including a Bowling Green, lit pitches, tennis courts and social club. Approximately 650 metres south of the site, beyond Adel Sports Club is Bedquilts Recreation Ground which includes a number of grassed pitches and a car parking area. The site therefore has access to a good range of sports and leisure facilities.

Leeds City Council Highways (including Metro) have not assessed the site in terms of highways and accessibility. The assessment of site 2130 indicates that 50% of the site has access to shops and services. The site in question is located directly north of site 2130 and will have similar accessibility characteristics.

The site is therefore well located in relation to shops, services, schools, outdoor leisure

# General Comments

**Name: Mr And Mrs Cooke, The Singh**

**Representor No: PRS06534**

facilities, bus services and open space. The site is therefore located in a sustainable location.

## 3. Green Belt

Paragraph 80 of the NPPF sets out the 5 key purposes of the Green Belt:

- 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.

We have set out our assessment under these headings below.

To check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

Along the western and northern boundary of the site are dense tree belts which create defensible boundaries. To the eastern boundary is a cluster of residential and agricultural properties which are accessed from Church Lane as well as a gappy hedgerow and hedgerow trees. The southern boundary adjoins a parcel of PAS land which is shortly to be the subject of a planning application. It is clear that the site has defensible boundaries on all sides and would become well connected to the urban area following the development of the PAS land site to the south. These natural and man-made features provide defensible boundaries to the site. The site is therefore well contained and will relate well to the existing urban area of Adel and the PAS land site. The natural features surrounding the site and the urban area therefore provide clear defensible boundaries which will prevent unrestricted sprawl into the Green Belt.

The allocation of the site in the Site Allocations DPD will therefore not harm this purpose of including land within the Green Belt.

To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

The site is located on the northern fringe of Adel. The nearest settlement is Bramhope approximately 1.6km north-west of the site. Between the two urban areas is Golden Acre Park which is identified as a City Park within the Leeds Open Space Sport and Recreation Assessment. It is clear that this Green Belt buffer shall remain in situ and therefore maintain a permanent gap between the two urban areas. The development of the site will not reduce the gap and therefore it will retain an acceptable Green Belt buffer between the two urban areas. The development of the site will not therefore lead to the merging of two neighbouring settlements.

As the development of the site will not lead to a significant narrowing of the gap between Adel and Bramhope it will not harm the purpose of including land within the Green Belt.

To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

As set out above, the site has clear defensible boundaries to the adjoining Green Belt. These strong natural boundaries means that the development of the site will not lead to any encroachment into the Green Belt.

To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

It is our view that this purpose of the Green Belt is intended to apply for settlements such as York and not small parts of large scale urban areas or individual listed buildings.

Notwithstanding that above, the most recent appraisal of the Adel-St Johns Conservation Area was undertaken by Leeds City Council in 2009. The Conservation Area boundary runs along the eastern edge of Church Lane up to Back Church Lane. The Conservation Area boundary is located 190 metres south of the site boundary. It is proposed that the existing trees and planting are retained along this boundary and that additional supplementary planting is located at this boundary in order to preserve the setting of the Conservation Area and listed buildings within.

The proposed development is set to the east of Otley Road beyond an existing tree belt. The visual impact of the development upon the settlement of Adel, when approached from the north, will be minimal. The incorporation of the site into the existing settlement of Adel and the preservation of the tree belts will not therefore harm the setting and special character of Adel, the Conservation Area or the listed buildings.

The development of the site will not therefore harm this purpose of including land within the Green Belt.

To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

Adel is an affluent residential area and therefore there is no derelict or other land in need of regeneration.

Notwithstanding the above, we have already made reference to the housing need and it is clear that some greenfield and Green Belt land will need to be allocated for development. Therefore the purpose of including land within the Green Belt is not relevant.

The points set out above confirm that when assessed against the criteria of the NPPF that the land does not need to be kept permanently open. As the site does not perform an important Green Belt function there is no reason why the site could not be included within the settlement limits and should be allocated for residential development.

## 4. Flood Risk

The majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 1, residential development is therefore appropriate on the majority of the site. To the eastern fringe of the site there is a small area which lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3. It is proposed that the residential development will occur on the remainder of the site which lies within Flood Zone 1 and where development is acceptable. The eastern boundary of the site, which lies within Flood Zone 3 is to be retained as open space and would be utilised to enhance biodiversity.

As the majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 1, residential development is



# General Comments

---

**Name:** Mr And Mrs Cooke, The Singh

**Representor No:** PRS06534

appropriate.

In summary, we have assessed the site in the context of its availability, achievability and suitability for housing development and as a result of this assessment we have shown that there are no technical or planning policy issues which would preclude the residential development of the site, that the site is sustainably located, it is well related to the settlement and its associated infrastructure and that the site lies in a high market area and therefore there is no reason why the site, if allocated, would not deliver housing promptly. Based on the assessment it is our view that the site should be allocated for residential development.

Conclusions

In summary, the site has not been assessed under the Site Allocations DPD or the SHLAA. However, we have shown in this assessment that the site is appropriate for development. We have shown that the site is visually related to the urban area and given that the site has access to shops, services, facilities, leisure opportunities, schools and bus stops, it is plain that the site is appropriately and sustainably located. In the context of housing need we have shown that there are no policy issues which would preclude the allocation of this land in that the site does not perform a material Green Belt function and the site on the whole does not flood. We have also shown that there are no technical issues which would preclude the beneficial development of the site. Furthermore we have shown that the site is available for development and lies within a high market area and as such the allocation of the land for residential development in an early phase of the plan period would deliver much needed new houses.

Given all of the above it is concluded that the site should be allocated for residential development.

Site Plan Attached

---

**Name:** Keith Stringer

**Representor No:** PRS06538

Representation ID: REP07756

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Dear Mark [to Councillor Dobson]

Having read your submission to the SHLA on the need for a local development plan I completely agree and offer my support to your submission

---

**Name:** John Pearson

**Representor No:** PRS06549

Representation ID: REP07764

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Jenny Southern

**Representor No:** PRS06551

Representation ID: REP07765

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Alastair Parker

**Representor No:** PRS06553

Representation ID: REP07766

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Lesley Quayle

**Representor No:** PRS06554

Representation ID: REP07767

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Kathryn Robinson**

**Representor No: PRS06555**

Representation ID: REP07768      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Joshua Clapham**

**Representor No: PRS06556**

Representation ID: REP07769      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Suzanne Seaman**

**Representor No: PRS06557**

Representation ID: REP07770      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jo Holdsworth**

**Representor No: PRS06558**

Representation ID: REP07771      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Richard Clarkson**

**Representor No: PRS06560**

Representation ID: REP07773      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Helen Crossley**

**Representor No: PRS06561**

Representation ID: REP07774      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Renell Hewitt**

**Representor No: PRS06562**

Representation ID: REP07775      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Stewart Hardcastle**

**Representor No: PRS06563**

Representation ID: REP07776      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Julia Chantrell**

**Representor No: PRS06564**

Representation ID: REP07777      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Patrick Smith**

**Representor No: PRS06566**

Representation ID: REP07779      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Rebecca Harvey**

**Representor No: PRS06567**

Representation ID: REP07782      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Alan Sharman**

**Representor No: PRS06568**

Representation ID: REP07783      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Alison Lockwood**

**Representor No: PRS06569**

Representation ID: REP07784      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Robin Stubbs**

**Representor No: PRS06571**

Representation ID: REP07786      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Daniel Pullen**

**Representor No: PRS06572**

Representation ID: REP07787      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Kevin Ulyett**

**Representor No: PRS06573**

Representation ID: REP07788      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Sally Wray**

**Representor No: PRS06574**

Representation ID: REP07789      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Neil Leeming**

**Representor No: PRS06575**

Representation ID: REP07790      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Erica Philips**

**Representor No: PRS06576**

Representation ID: REP07791      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Ella Baxter**

**Representor No: PRS06577**

Representation ID: REP07792      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Lisa Muscroft**

**Representor No: PRS06578**

Representation ID: REP07793      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Gordon Hewitt**

**Representor No: PRS06580**

Representation ID: REP07795      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Sierra Dalmolin**

**Representor No: PRS06581**

Representation ID: REP07796      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: John Haig**

**Representor No: PRS06582**

Representation ID: REP07797      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Vicki Haig**

**Representor No: PRS06583**

Representation ID: REP07798      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jane Wilson**

**Representor No: PRS06584**

Representation ID: REP07799      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Pamela Engledow**

**Representor No: PRS06585**

Representation ID: REP07800      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: William Watt**

**Representor No: PRS06586**

Representation ID: REP07801      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jo Yeomans**

**Representor No: PRS06587**

Representation ID: REP07802      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Gillian Corwin**

**Representor No: PRS06588**

Representation ID: REP07803      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Debbie Corwin**

**Representor No: PRS06589**

Representation ID: REP07804      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Talia Ward**

**Representor No: PRS06590**

Representation ID: REP07805      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Sella Johnson**

**Representor No: PRS06591**

Representation ID: REP07807      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Claire Dearden**

**Representor No: PRS06592**

Representation ID: REP07808      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Richard Dimery**

**Representor No: PRS06593**

Representation ID: REP07809      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Martin Fisher**

**Representor No: PRS06594**

Representation ID: REP07810      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Sue Engledow**

**Representor No: PRS06595**

Representation ID: REP07811      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Alison Jackson**

**Representor No: PRS06596**

Representation ID: REP07812      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Nicoola Philis**

**Representor No: PRS06597**

Representation ID: REP07813      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Tim Clark**

**Representor No: PRS06598**

Representation ID: REP07815      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Cayte Norman**

**Representor No: PRS06599**

Representation ID: REP07816      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Neil Stirk**

**Representor No: PRS06600**

Representation ID: REP07817      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Julie Harrison**

**Representor No: PRS06601**

Representation ID: REP07818      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Craig Kelly**

**Representor No: PRS06602**

Representation ID: REP07819      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Kirsty Walker**

**Representor No: PRS06603**

Representation ID: REP07820      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Claire Myers**

**Representor No: PRS06604**

Representation ID: REP07821      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Hearther Pawsey**

**Representor No: PRS06605**

Representation ID: REP07822      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Eric Eastwood**

**Representor No: PRS06606**

Representation ID: REP07824      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Angela Birkin**

**Representor No: PRS06607**

Representation ID: REP07825      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Keith Walker**

**Representor No: PRS06608**

Representation ID: REP07826      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Susan Brosnan**

**Representor No: PRS06609**

Representation ID: REP07828      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Mark Forkin**

**Representor No: PRS06610**

Representation ID: REP07830      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Paul Wright**

**Representor No: PRS06611**

Representation ID: REP07832      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.



# General Comments

---

**Name:** David Hunter

**Representor No:** PRS06612

Representation ID: REP07831      Question Ref: H10

Housing

[See plan submitted showing the location of the site and separate SHLAA submission]

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This supporting document relates to the site of Ferndale House, Colliers Lane, Shadwell, Leeds, LS17 8LP that consists of 11,430sq/m or 1.143ha. Our client, requests that his site be considered for housing allocation as part of the forthcoming Strategic Housing Land Availability review. This document presents a reasoned summary for the assistance of local planning authority in its assessment of the potential residential allocation of the site.

1.2 The site sits in the Green Belt and consists of large grass lawns with drive and extensive hard standing areas. The Southern and Eastern boundaries have mature trees and shrubs that visually obscure views from and on to the site. It is bounded by fields and is approximately 325m from Shadwell Main Street.

2 - site plan 3 - aerial photo - [see representation submitted for full details]

## 4.0 Planning Considerations

4.1 We understand that the Leeds City Council's Publication Draft Core Strategy, February 2012 indicates a housing requirement of 3660 dwellings per annum up until 2016/17, increasing to 4700 dwellings per annum from 2017/18.

4.2 The Regional Spatial Strategy indicates an annual net requirement of 4300 dwellings in the Leeds District for the period from 2008 to 2026.

4.3 The Local Development Framework Publication Draft Core Strategy, 2012, indicates a substantially increased housing land requirement of 70,000 new dwellings between 2012 and 2018 to be provided by 3,660 per annum from 2012/13 up until 2016/17. The remaining dwellings are to be provided at a rate of 4,700 per annum up until 2017/18.

4.4 The LDF-DCS 2012 states that this substantially increased housing Land requirement will require urban extensions on green-field sites and upon greenbelt land, to meet this longer term housing requirement.

4.5 The new National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 states that there should be a presumption in favour for sustainable development and that the new Framework should deliver a wide choice of high quality homes.

4.6 The new NPPF also states that sustainable development should be located where it can "enhance or maintain" the vitality of rural communities such as Shadwell, Leeds

4.7 The Ferndale House site is close to all the facilities provided in the village of Shadwell that include; Bus stops, Post Office, Church, Primary School, Public House, Social Club, and Cricket Club.

## 5.0 Land Supply Considerations

5.1 National Planning policy Framework, March 2012 requires local authorities to identify and maintain a rolling 5 year supply of deliverable land for housing.

5.2 The Regional Spatial Strategy identifies an annual net requirement for 4300 dwellings for the period 2008 to 2026. The five year requirement means Leeds must identify land sufficient to for 21,500 dwellings.

5.3 Leeds City Council's Public Consultation Core Strategy indicates an increase in required housing over and above that stated in the LDF period of 3,660 dwellings per annum for the period 2012/13 to 2016/2017 increasing to 4,700 per annum from 2017/2018.

5.4 Leeds City Councils current 5 year supply of dwellings is approximately 15,000 dwellings and as such sites must be identified to increase the supply to the target levels.

5.5 Leeds City Council has accepted that it must consider green-field and Greenbelt land to meet the housing requirement up until 2028 in it's LDF Publication Draft Core Strategy.

## 6.0 Conclusion

6.1 The Ferndale House site is located on the edge of the Village of Shadwell and all its facilities.

6.2 The site has an existing large residential property which historically was two separate homes. We believe that the site could provide an opportunity to develop a small community of dwellings that would place an undue burden on the facilities of Shadwell.

6.3 Leeds City Council has accepted that it must consider green-field & Greenbelt sites to meet its dwellings target. We submit that the site does little to contribute to the character of the landscape and is primarily associated with the existing residential property.

6.4 The site is not within a flood risk area; please refer to the Environment Agency flood risk map below. [see representation submitted for full details]

---

Representation ID: REP07831      Question Ref: H11

Housing

[planning application 2015, commencement on site 2016 anticipated in SHLAA submission]

---

**Name:** Emma Pawsey

**Representor No:** PRS06614

Representation ID: REP07834      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Lauren Welbourne

**Representor No:** PRS06615

Representation ID: REP07835      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Alex Chantrell**

**Representor No: PRS06616**

Representation ID: REP07836      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Susan Turnbull**

**Representor No: PRS06617**

Representation ID: REP07837      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Simon Ellner**

**Representor No: PRS06618**

Representation ID: REP07838      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Rebecca Lamb**

**Representor No: PRS06619**

Representation ID: REP07839      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Andrew Ellner**

**Representor No: PRS06620**

Representation ID: REP07840      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Paula Boggs**

**Representor No: PRS06621**

Representation ID: REP07841      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: David Brayshay**

**Representor No: PRS06622**

Representation ID: REP07842      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Mark Sands**

**Representor No: PRS06623**

Representation ID: REP07843      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Roslyne Smith**

**Representor No: PRS06624**

Representation ID: REP07845      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: David Smith**

**Representor No: PRS06625**

Representation ID: REP07846      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Sandra Place**

**Representor No: PRS06628**

Representation ID: REP07847      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Richard Child**

**Representor No: PRS06629**

Representation ID: REP07848      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Chris Wellbourne**

**Representor No: PRS06630**

Representation ID: REP07849      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Andrea Fletcher**

**Representor No: PRS06631**

Representation ID: REP07850      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jenny T**

**Representor No: PRS06632**

Representation ID: REP07851      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Sally Cox**

**Representor No: PRS06634**

Representation ID: REP07852      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Jo Jobling**

**Representor No: PRS06635**

Representation ID: REP07853      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Kate Brook**

**Representor No: PRS06636**

Representation ID: REP07854      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Vanessa White**

**Representor No: PRS06637**

Representation ID: REP07855      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Suzanne Boutcher**

**Representor No: PRS06638**

Representation ID: REP07856      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Mary Whitford**

**Representor No: PRS06639**

Representation ID: REP07857      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Louise Child**

**Representor No: PRS06640**

Representation ID: REP07858      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Inna Kochetkova**

**Representor No: PRS06641**

Representation ID: REP07859      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Helen Town**

**Representor No: PRS06642**

Representation ID: REP07860      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Rob Rattray**

**Representor No: PRS06644**

Representation ID: REP07862      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jane Siney**

**Representor No: PRS06645**

Representation ID: REP07863      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Joanne Smith**

**Representor No: PRS06646**

Representation ID: REP07864      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Abigail Liddle**

**Representor No: PRS06648**

Representation ID: REP07867      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Michael Kershaw**

**Representor No: PRS06650**

Representation ID: REP03406      Question Ref: H1

Housing

Cookridge needs no more housing developments - Strongly agree.

The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem. Strongly agree. Vehicle parked on the road cause traffic flow problem now, it would get worse if traffic level increases.

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

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

Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat- Strongly agree.

---

**Name: Helen Dutton**

**Representor No: PRS06651**

Representation ID: REP07869      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Joanne Kelly**

**Representor No: PRS06652**

Representation ID: REP07870      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Bethany Storey**

**Representor No: PRS06653**

Representation ID: REP07871      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Daisy Johnson**

**Representor No: PRS06654**

Representation ID: REP07872      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Karrieann Massam**

**Representor No: PRS06655**

Representation ID: REP07873      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Peter Massam**

**Representor No: PRS06656**

Representation ID: REP07874      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Susan Roy**

**Representor No: PRS06657**

Representation ID: REP07875      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Helen Thornton**

**Representor No: PRS06658**

Representation ID: REP07876      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Bev Jones**

**Representor No: PRS06660**

Representation ID: REP07879      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: R Knowles**

**Representor No: PRS06663**

Representation ID: REP07887      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Rothwell 4x4 centre land to the east of Wakefield Road, Oulton  
See submitted representation for full details.

This is an initial representation to Leeds City Council that the site currently occupied by Rothwell 4 x 4 Centre should be considered favourably for redevelopment by the Local Planning Authority.

4.2 Whilst the site is presently within the Green Belt, it is clear that its development;

1. Will not prejudice or undermine the function of the Green Belt;

2. Would result in the removal of a previously developed site that is aesthetically unattractive;

3. Would result in significant economic, social and environmental improvements which would be to the benefit of the whole area;

4. Is highly sustainable and, in addition, would result in the enhancement of public transport strategies and initiatives for the City Region; and

5. Would result in major improvements in the type, form and accessibility that many have to local amenities and public open space,

4.3 The development of this site would have significant positives that in turn would result in the major regeneration of a former mining community.

4.4 In this context, the Local Planning Authority are respectfully requested to assess the proposals and to support them in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development introduced by the National Planning Policy Framework.

---

**Name: Kris Roy**

**Representor No: PRS06666**

Representation ID: REP07892      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Claire Hughes**

**Representor No: PRS06668**

Representation ID: REP07900      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Paul Jenkins**

**Representor No: PRS06669**

Representation ID: REP07901      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Paul Ryan**

**Representor No: PRS06670**

Representation ID: REP07902      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Sharon O'Connor**

**Representor No: PRS06671**

Representation ID: REP07903      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Lindsay Dixon**

**Representor No: PRS06672**

Representation ID: REP07904      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Claire Lee**

**Representor No: PRS06673**

Representation ID: REP07905      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Zoe Johnson**

**Representor No: PRS06674**

Representation ID: REP07907      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Susan Stubbs**

**Representor No: PRS06675**

Representation ID: REP07909      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Helen Dabill**

**Representor No: PRS06676**

Representation ID: REP07910      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Daniel Beck**

**Representor No: PRS06677**

Representation ID: REP07912      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.



# General Comments

Name: Martin Fox

Representor No: PRS06678

Representation ID: REP07913 Question Ref: H1 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?

Yes.

Representation ID: REP07913 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP07913 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP07913 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.

If So, please give site reference and reason

See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.

In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP07913 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP07913 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP07913 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.

No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP07913 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.

We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP07913 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.

With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Martin Fox

**Representor No:** PRS06678

Representation ID: REP07913      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP07913      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Martin Fox

Representor No: PRS06678

Representation ID: REP07913

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Ruth Evans**

**Representor No: PRS06679**

Representation ID: REP07915      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Louise Higgins**

**Representor No: PRS06680**

Representation ID: REP07916      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Sophie Johnson**

**Representor No: PRS06681**

Representation ID: REP07918      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Laura Yeomans**

**Representor No: PRS06682**

Representation ID: REP07919      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Janice Shaw**

**Representor No: PRS06683**

Representation ID: REP07920      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Joanne Milsom**

**Representor No: PRS06684**

Representation ID: REP07921      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Louise Dawson**

**Representor No: PRS06685**

Representation ID: REP07922      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Michelle Thompson**

**Representor No: PRS06686**

Representation ID: REP07923      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Suzy Challoner**

**Representor No: PRS06687**

Representation ID: REP07924      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Helen Gilmartin**

**Representor No: PRS06688**

Representation ID: REP07925      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: James Tetley**

**Representor No: PRS06689**

Representation ID: REP07926      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Claire Nixon**

**Representor No: PRS06690**

Representation ID: REP07927      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Lydia Wharton**

**Representor No: PRS06691**

Representation ID: REP07928      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jeff Gantschuk**

**Representor No: PRS06692**

Representation ID: REP07929      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Frank Lyden**

**Representor No: PRS06693**

Representation ID: REP07930      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Carrie Evans**

**Representor No: PRS06694**

Representation ID: REP07931      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Alexis Littlewood**

**Representor No: PRS06695**

Representation ID: REP07932      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: James Seals**

**Representor No: PRS06696**

Representation ID: REP07933      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: David Story**

**Representor No: PRS06697**

Representation ID: REP07934      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Amy Shackleton**

**Representor No: PRS06698**

Representation ID: REP07935      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Kate Reynolds**

**Representor No: PRS06699**

Representation ID: REP07937      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Liz Burrows**

**Representor No: PRS06700**

Representation ID: REP07938      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Freddie Lawson**

**Representor No: PRS06701**

Representation ID: REP07939      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Amy Dodd**

**Representor No: PRS06702**

Representation ID: REP07940      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Katie Kendall**

**Representor No: PRS06703**

Representation ID: REP07941      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Lisa Hudson**

**Representor No: PRS06704**

Representation ID: REP07942      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Deborah Atkinson**

**Representor No: PRS06705**

Representation ID: REP07943      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Mandy Dixon**

**Representor No: PRS06706**

Representation ID: REP07944      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Rebecca Lamb**

**Representor No: PRS06707**

Representation ID: REP07945      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Peter Stitt**

**Representor No: PRS06708**

Representation ID: REP07946      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: James Robinson**

**Representor No: PRS06709**

Representation ID: REP07947      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Pam Scott**

**Representor No: PRS06710**

Representation ID: REP07948      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Sadie Greenwood**

**Representor No: PRS06711**

Representation ID: REP07949      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Pamela Scott**

**Representor No: PRS06712**

Representation ID: REP07951      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Adele Sunley**

**Representor No: PRS06713**

Representation ID: REP07952      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Clare Wassell**

**Representor No: PRS06714**

Representation ID: REP07953      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Matthew Mulley**

**Representor No: PRS06715**

Representation ID: REP07954      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Debbie Gill**

**Representor No: PRS06716**

Representation ID: REP07955      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Gareth Pipe**

**Representor No: PRS06717**

Representation ID: REP07956      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Simon Oldham**

**Representor No: PRS06718**

Representation ID: REP07957      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.



# General Comments

**Name:** Lisa Fox

**Representor No:** PRS06719

Representation ID: REP07958      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP07958      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP07958      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP07958      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP07958      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP07958      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP07958      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP07958      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP07958      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Lisa Fox

**Representor No:** PRS06719

Representation ID: REP07958      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP07958      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Lisa Fox

Representor No: PRS06719

Representation ID: REP07958

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Julie Hobson**

**Representor No: PRS06720**

Representation ID: REP07959      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Sue Bell**

**Representor No: PRS06721**

Representation ID: REP07960      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Louise Dunsire**

**Representor No: PRS06722**

Representation ID: REP07961      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Chris Kelly**

**Representor No: PRS06724**

Representation ID: REP07962      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: John Lupton**

**Representor No: PRS06725**

Representation ID: REP07963      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Shain Wells**

**Representor No: PRS06726**

Representation ID: REP07964      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Elizabeth Maskew**

**Representor No: PRS06727**

Representation ID: REP07965      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Tamara Kallas**

**Representor No: PRS06728**

Representation ID: REP07966      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Belinda Hunter**

**Representor No: PRS06729**

Representation ID: REP07967      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Sara Parr**

**Representor No: PRS06730**

Representation ID: REP07968      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: David Parr**

**Representor No: PRS06731**

Representation ID: REP07969      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Charlotte Evans**

**Representor No: PRS06732**

Representation ID: REP07970      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: David Morley**

**Representor No: PRS06733**

Representation ID: REP07972      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Andrew Clayton**

**Representor No: PRS06735**

Representation ID: REP07973      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Martin Elam**

**Representor No: PRS06736**

Representation ID: REP07974      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Rebecca Mears**

**Representor No: PRS06737**

Representation ID: REP07975      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Lee Hebden**

**Representor No: PRS06738**

Representation ID: REP07976      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Irene Greenwood**

**Representor No: PRS06740**

Representation ID: REP07977      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Joanne Harrison**

**Representor No: PRS06741**

Representation ID: REP07978      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Claire Walter**

**Representor No: PRS06743**

Representation ID: REP07979      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Fiona Dodds**

**Representor No: PRS06744**

Representation ID: REP07980      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: James Wright**

**Representor No: PRS06746**

Representation ID: REP07981      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: David Park**

**Representor No: PRS06749**

Representation ID: REP07985      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07993 Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Metro have assisted the council in providing accessibility assessment mapping for the all the site allocations in the consultation. The following tables provide a summary of the accessibility analysis undertake for the housing and employment allocations. The assessments are intended to give a strategic overview of the accessibility of the allocations. Detailed site by site analysis would still be required as if these sites are brought forward for development.

## General Comments

Metro encourages developments to be located close to the existing public transport network. By locating developments close to existing public transport, sustainable travel becomes a more realistic alternative to the car. The LDF policy on accessibility promotes this approach and places an expectation on developers to improve public transport services to a minimum level if they locate away from the core network. By allocating sites that are located in accessible areas, the cost to developers, in terms of public transport mitigation, on the whole, will be reduced.

However, we recognise that some land allocations outside this the core public transport network will inevitably be required. The challenge is to ensure that where inaccessible sites are selected, the public transport network can be enhanced to accommodate the prop-osed developments through the commercial network or through developer subsidy (through section 106 payments).

Representation ID: REP08045 Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Metro have assisted the council in providing accessibility assessment mapping for the all the site allocations in the consultation. The following tables provide a summary of the accessibility analysis undertake for the housing and employment allocations. The assessments are intended to give a strategic overview of the accessibility of the allocations. Detailed site by site analysis would still be required as if these sites are brought forward for development.

## General Comments

Metro encourages developments to be located close to the existing public transport network. By locating developments close to existing public transport, sustainable travel becomes a more realistic alternative to the car. The LDF policy on accessibility promotes this approach and places an expectation on developers to improve public transport services to a minimum level if they locate away from the core network. By allocating sites that are located in accessible areas, the cost to developers, in terms of public transport mitigation, on the whole, will be reduced.

However, we recognise that some land allocations outside this the core public transport network will inevitably be required. The challenge is to ensure that where inaccessible sites are selected, the public transport network can be enhanced to accommodate the prop-osed developments through the commercial network or through developer subsidy (through section 106 payments).

Representation ID: REP08045 Question Ref: General comment

Employment

2001330, 2001333 and 2003679

## 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 the table of sites. This rep no. links to employment sites in City Centre area.]

NB 3 sites listed in table 6 employment sites, city centre are not listed in Site Allocations document for city centre - these are sites 2001330, 2001333 and 2003679]

Representation ID: REP08055 Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Metro have assisted the council in providing accessibility assessment mapping for the all the site allocations in the consultation. The following tables provide a summary of the accessibility analysis undertake for the housing and employment allocations. The assessments are intended to give a strategic overview of the accessibility of the allocations. Detailed site by site analysis would still be required as if these sites are brought forward for development.

## General Comments

Metro encourages developments to be located close to the existing public transport network. By locating developments close to existing public transport, sustainable travel becomes a more realistic alternative to the car. The LDF policy on accessibility promotes this approach and places an expectation on developers to improve public transport services to a minimum level if they locate away from the core network. By allocating sites that are located in accessible areas, the cost to developers, in terms of public transport mitigation, on the whole, will be reduced.

However, we recognise that some land allocations outside this the core public transport network will inevitably be required. The challenge is to ensure that where inaccessible sites are selected, the public transport network can be enhanced to accommodate the prop-osed developments through the commercial network or through developer subsidy (through section 106 payments).

# General Comments

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08063 Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Metro have assisted the council in providing accessibility assessment mapping for the all the site allocations in the consultation. The following tables provide a summary of the accessibility analysis undertake for the housing and employment allocations. The assessments are intended to give a strategic overview of the accessibility of the allocations. Detailed site by site analysis would still be required as if these sites are brought forward for development.

## General Comments

Metro encourages developments to be located close to the existing public transport network. By locating developments close to existing public transport, sustainable travel becomes a more realistic alternative to the car. The LDF policy on accessibility promotes this approach and places an expectation on developers to improve public transport services to a minimum level if they locate away from the core network. By allocating sites that are located in accessible areas, the cost to developers, in terms of public transport mitigation, on the whole, will be reduced.

However, we recognise that some land allocations outside this the core public transport network will inevitably be required. The challenge is to ensure that where inaccessible sites are selected, the public transport network can be enhanced to accommodate the prop-osed developments through the commercial network or through developer subsidy (through section 106 payments).

Representation ID: REP08063 Question Ref: General comment

Employment

[Site 5 is listed as a site ref in table 6 employment sites, but not listed as site in Inner Area site allocations document]

## 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 tables of sites. This rep no links to sites in Inner area only]

Representation ID: REP08067 Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Metro have assisted the council in providing accessibility assessment mapping for the all the site allocations in the consultation. The following tables provide a summary of the accessibility analysis undertake for the housing and employment allocations. The assessments are intended to give a strategic overview of the accessibility of the allocations. Detailed site by site analysis would still be required as if these sites are brought forward for development.

## General Comments

Metro encourages developments to be located close to the existing public transport network. By locating developments close to existing public transport, sustainable travel becomes a more realistic alternative to the car. The LDF policy on accessibility promotes this approach and places an expectation on developers to improve public transport services to a minimum level if they locate away from the core network. By allocating sites that are located in accessible areas, the cost to developers, in terms of public transport mitigation, on the whole, will be reduced.

However, we recognise that some land allocations outside this the core public transport network will inevitably be required. The challenge is to ensure that where inaccessible sites are selected, the public transport network can be enhanced to accommodate the prop-osed developments through the commercial network or through developer subsidy (through section 106 payments).

Representation ID: REP08075 Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Metro have assisted the council in providing accessibility assessment mapping for the all the site allocations in the consultation. The following tables provide a summary of the accessibility analysis undertake for the housing and employment allocations. The assessments are intended to give a strategic overview of the accessibility of the allocations. Detailed site by site analysis would still be required as if these sites are brought forward for development.

## General Comments

Metro encourages developments to be located close to the existing public transport network. By locating developments close to existing public transport, sustainable travel becomes a more realistic alternative to the car. The LDF policy on accessibility promotes this approach and places an expectation on developers to improve public transport services to a minimum level if they locate away from the core network. By allocating sites that are located in accessible areas, the cost to developers, in terms of public transport mitigation, on the whole, will be reduced.

However, we recognise that some land allocations outside this the core public transport network will inevitably be required. The challenge is to ensure that where inaccessible sites are selected, the public transport network can be enhanced to accommodate the prop-osed developments through the commercial network or through developer subsidy (through section 106 payments).



# General Comments

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08082      Question Ref: General comment

Employment

## 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 North West area]

Representation ID: REP08082      Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Metro have assisted the council in providing accessibility assessment mapping for the all the site allocations in the consultation. The following tables provide a summary of the accessibility analysis undertake for the housing and employment allocations. The assessments are intended to give a strategic overview of the accessibility of the allocations. Detailed site by site analysis would still be required as if these sites are brought forward for development.

### General Comments

Metro encourages developments to be located close to the existing public transport network. By locating developments close to existing public transport, sustainable travel becomes a more realistic alternative to the car. The LDF policy on accessibility promotes this approach and places an expectation on developers to improve public transport services to a minimum level if they locate away from the core network. By allocating sites that are located in accessible areas, the cost to developers, in terms of public transport mitigation, on the whole, will be reduced.

However, we recognise that some land allocations outside this the core public transport network will inevitably be required. The challenge is to ensure that where inaccessible sites are selected, the public transport network can be enhanced to accommodate the prop-osed developments through the commercial network or through developer subsidy (through section 106 payments).

Representation ID: REP08090      Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Metro have assisted the council in providing accessibility assessment mapping for the all the site allocations in the consultation. The following tables provide a summary of the accessibility analysis undertake for the housing and employment allocations. The assessments are intended to give a strategic overview of the accessibility of the allocations. Detailed site by site analysis would still be required as if these sites are brought forward for development.

### General Comments

Metro encourages developments to be located close to the existing public transport network. By locating developments close to existing public transport, sustainable travel becomes a more realistic alternative to the car. The LDF policy on accessibility promotes this approach and places an expectation on developers to improve public transport services to a minimum level if they locate away from the core network. By allocating sites that are located in accessible areas, the cost to developers, in terms of public transport mitigation, on the whole, will be reduced.

However, we recognise that some land allocations outside this the core public transport network will inevitably be required. The challenge is to ensure that where inaccessible sites are selected, the public transport network can be enhanced to accommodate the prop-osed developments through the commercial network or through developer subsidy (through section 106 payments).

Representation ID: REP08098      Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Metro have assisted the council in providing accessibility assessment mapping for the all the site allocations in the consultation. The following tables provide a summary of the accessibility analysis undertake for the housing and employment allocations. The assessments are intended to give a strategic overview of the accessibility of the allocations. Detailed site by site analysis would still be required as if these sites are brought forward for development.

### General Comments

Metro encourages developments to be located close to the existing public transport network. By locating developments close to existing public transport, sustainable travel becomes a more realistic alternative to the car. The LDF policy on accessibility promotes this approach and places an expectation on developers to improve public transport services to a minimum level if they locate away from the core network. By allocating sites that are located in accessible areas, the cost to developers, in terms of public transport mitigation, on the whole, will be reduced.

However, we recognise that some land allocations outside this the core public transport network will inevitably be required. The challenge is to ensure that where inaccessible sites are selected, the public transport network can be enhanced to accommodate the prop-osed developments through the commercial network or through developer subsidy (through section 106 payments).

# General Comments

---

**Name: Michael Long**

**Representor No: PRS06750**

Representation ID: REP08098

Question Ref: General comment

Employment

[NB 2 sites are listed in table 6 employment sites Outer South East as site ref 0 - cannot determine which sites these are]

## 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 to 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 East]

---

Representation ID: REP08105

Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Metro have assisted the council in providing accessibility assessment mapping for the all the site allocations in the consultation. The following tables provide a summary of the accessibility analysis undertake for the housing and employment allocations. The assessments are intended to give a strategic overview of the accessibility of the allocations. Detailed site by site analysis would still be required as if these sites are brought forward for development.

### General Comments

Metro encourages developments to be located close to the existing public transport network. By locating developments close to existing public transport, sustainable travel becomes a more realistic alternative to the car. The LDF policy on accessibility promotes this approach and places an expectation on developers to improve public transport services to a minimum level if they locate away from the core network. By allocating sites that are located in accessible areas, the cost to developers, in terms of public transport mitigation, on the whole, will be reduced.

However, we recognise that some land allocations outside this the core public transport network will inevitably be required. The challenge is to ensure that where inaccessible sites are selected, the public transport network can be enhanced to accommodate the prop-osed developments through the commercial network or through developer subsidy (through section 106 payments).

---

Representation ID: REP08115

Question Ref: General comment

Employment

Metro have assisted the council in providing accessibility assessment mapping for the all the site allocations in the consultation. The following tables provide a summary of the accessibility analysis undertake for the housing and employment allocations. The assessments are intended to give a strategic overview of the accessibility of the allocations. Detailed site by site analysis would still be required as if these sites are brought forward for development.

### General Comments

Metro encourages developments to be located close to the existing public transport network. By locating developments close to existing public transport, sustainable travel becomes a more realistic alternative to the car. The LDF policy on accessibility promotes this approach and places an expectation on developers to improve public transport services to a minimum level if they locate away from the core network. By allocating sites that are located in accessible areas, the cost to developers, in terms of public transport mitigation, on the whole, will be reduced.

However, we recognise that some land allocations outside this the core public transport network will inevitably be required. The challenge is to ensure that where inaccessible sites are selected, the public transport network can be enhanced to accommodate the prop-osed developments through the commercial network or through developer subsidy (through section 106 payments).

---

**Name: Diane Paterson**

**Representor No: PRS06751**

Representation ID: REP07986

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Catherine Eastbourne**

**Representor No: PRS06752**

Representation ID: REP07987

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Elizabeth Keefe**

**Representor No: PRS06753**

Representation ID: REP07989      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Katie Campbell**

**Representor No: PRS06754**

Representation ID: REP07982      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jodie Double**

**Representor No: PRS06755**

Representation ID: REP07522      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Clio Scott**

**Representor No: PRS06756**

Representation ID: REP07991      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Emily Metcalf-corrison**

**Representor No: PRS06757**

Representation ID: REP07992      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Lynne Ogden**

**Representor No: PRS06759**

Representation ID: REP07994      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Louise Murphy**

**Representor No: PRS06760**

Representation ID: REP07984      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Anne Barker**

**Representor No: PRS06761**

Representation ID: REP07988      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Mary Cockroft**

**Representor No: PRS06762**

Representation ID: REP07990      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Helen Ankin**

**Representor No: PRS06763**

Representation ID: REP07995      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Chris Baxter**

**Representor No: PRS06764**

Representation ID: REP07996      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Gail Vink**

**Representor No: PRS06765**

Representation ID: REP07997      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Fiona Pierse**

**Representor No: PRS06766**

Representation ID: REP07998      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Alun Evans**

**Representor No: PRS06767**

Representation ID: REP08002      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Sandra Lamb**

**Representor No: PRS06768**

Representation ID: REP08003      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Andrea Lofthouse**

**Representor No: PRS06770**

Representation ID: REP08004      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Jane Richardson**

**Representor No: PRS06771**

Representation ID: REP08005      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Michelle Ogden**

**Representor No: PRS06772**

Representation ID: REP08006      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jayne Storey**

**Representor No: PRS06773**

Representation ID: REP08007      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Alison Jackson-dove**

**Representor No: PRS06774**

Representation ID: REP08008      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Philip Hemsworth**

**Representor No: PRS06775**

Representation ID: REP08009      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Karen Ellis**

**Representor No: PRS06776**

Representation ID: REP08014      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Simon Robinson**

**Representor No: PRS06777**

Representation ID: REP08011      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Amanda Lawn**

**Representor No: PRS06778**

Representation ID: REP08010      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Joanne Taylor**

**Representor No: PRS06779**

Representation ID: REP08012      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jenny Busfield**

**Representor No: PRS06780**

Representation ID: REP08013      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Steph Gray**

**Representor No: PRS06781**

Representation ID: REP08015      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Louise Bennett**

**Representor No: PRS06782**

Representation ID: REP08016      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Janet Skelton**

**Representor No: PRS06783**

Representation ID: REP08017      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Laura Bond**

**Representor No: PRS06784**

Representation ID: REP07999      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Natasha Loveridge**

**Representor No: PRS06785**

Representation ID: REP08020      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jenny Clayton**

**Representor No: PRS06786**

Representation ID: REP08000      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Rebekah Newcombe**

**Representor No: PRS06787**

Representation ID: REP08022      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Beverly Calver**

**Representor No: PRS06788**

Representation ID: REP08024      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Victoria Darwin**

**Representor No: PRS06789**

Representation ID: REP08001      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jane McLaughlin**

**Representor No: PRS06790**

Representation ID: REP08026      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jack Collinson**

**Representor No: PRS06791**

Representation ID: REP08027      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Lynn Peck**

**Representor No: PRS06792**

Representation ID: REP08028      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Rachel Pontefract**

**Representor No: PRS06793**

Representation ID: REP08018      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Laura Rice**

**Representor No: PRS06794**

Representation ID: REP08030      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Jophine Wright**

**Representor No: PRS06795**

Representation ID: REP08031      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Julie Franklin**

**Representor No: PRS06796**

Representation ID: REP08033      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Gareth Edwards**

**Representor No: PRS06797**

Representation ID: REP08035      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jackie Ash**

**Representor No: PRS06798**

Representation ID: REP08037      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Wendy Williams**

**Representor No: PRS06799**

Representation ID: REP08038      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Daniel Clark**

**Representor No: PRS06800**

Representation ID: REP08040      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Wendy Kershaw**

**Representor No: PRS06801**

Representation ID: REP08039      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Steven Joy**

**Representor No: PRS06802**

Representation ID: REP08042      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.



# General Comments

---

**Name: Diana Al-saadi**

**Representor No: PRS06803**

Representation ID: REP08041      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Beverley Sproats**

**Representor No: PRS06804**

Representation ID: REP08043      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Julie Steel**

**Representor No: PRS06805**

Representation ID: REP08046      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Terence Edward Dudley**

**Representor No: PRS06806**

Representation ID: REP08044      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Lorraine Cookson**

**Representor No: PRS06807**

Representation ID: REP08048      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Katherine Robertshaw**

**Representor No: PRS06808**

Representation ID: REP08049      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Francis Spenser**

**Representor No: PRS06809**

Representation ID: REP08051      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Barbara Dean**

**Representor No: PRS06810**

Representation ID: REP08052      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Catherine O'Connor**

**Representor No: PRS06811**

Representation ID: REP08053      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Anna Bradbury**

**Representor No: PRS06812**

Representation ID: REP08054      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Andrea Hinkley**

**Representor No: PRS06813**

Representation ID: REP08056      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Heidi Reynolds**

**Representor No: PRS06814**

Representation ID: REP08057      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Clive Bagley**

**Representor No: PRS06815**

Representation ID: REP08059      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Martin Townshend**

**Representor No: PRS06816**

Representation ID: REP08058      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Bernadette Walker**

**Representor No: PRS06817**

Representation ID: REP08060      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Joan Kaye**

**Representor No: PRS06818**

Representation ID: REP08061      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Jonathan Radford**

**Representor No: PRS06820**

Representation ID: REP08062      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Teresa Hall**

**Representor No: PRS06821**

Representation ID: REP08064      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Gaynor Smith**

**Representor No: PRS06822**

Representation ID: REP08065      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Gareth Smith**

**Representor No: PRS06823**

Representation ID: REP08066      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Frances Nutt**

**Representor No: PRS06824**

Representation ID: REP08070      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Christine Hall**

**Representor No: PRS06825**

Representation ID: REP08069      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee**

**Representor No: PRS06826**

Representation ID: REP07896      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

We disagree fundamentally with the LDF claim that there is an objectively assessed need for 74,000 new dwellings within the life of the LDF.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP07896      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

The logic behind the HMCA boundaries hasn't been set out in any understandable way; it is believed that they were drawn up by outside consultants rather than council officers. We believe that the boundary of the Outer South West Hly!CA isn't rational. To help public understanding and coherent decision making, City Council ward boundaries should be followed by those of the HMCAs wherever possible; if there has to be deviation from ward boundaries, it should be explained and justified.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP07896      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Leeds does have scope to expand along the northern and eastern margins of its main urban area without harmful coalescence or infilling of strategic Green Belt; the danger of undue expansion of the built up area in Outer South West is that it would push West Yorkshire towards becoming a continuous conurbation, another Birmingham or Greater Manchester, with consequent harm to quality of life and discouragement of inward investment. This would be especially so if combined with uncoordinated extensive development in nearby parts of Bradford, Kirklees and Wakefield.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP07896      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

No explanation or justification has been put forward for the housing targets in the various HMCAs; it is unclear why Outer South West has been allocated 11% of the Leeds-wide total, whilst A ire borough and Outer North West have 3% each and Outer South has 4%.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP07896      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

At 10.3.1 there is a table of sites with unimplemented or part-implemented housing planning permissions. Some of these may have had the benefit of more than one permission, only one of which could be turned into bricks and mortar, so the "unimplemented" list may not be entirely realistic.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP07896      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

If much new house building takes place in OSW, there will be a need for new primary and high schools. High schools need large sites; we believe that such sites would best be found on PAS land, to avoid large incursions into Green Belt. Many sites, especially infill, brownfield and windfall, aren't big enough to take a school even though their accumulating totals of dwellings might be quite large. Everyone should be aware that there is no presumption of housing on PAS land; its reservation is for wider strategic land supply purposes.

See rep for full details

Representation ID: REP07896      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

We believe that none of the PAS land should be allocated for housing at this stage; some PAS sites might go for housing in a future five year review, others might be the only sites big enough to take schools and other extensive single uses and should be strategically reserved for that purpose. We recognise that even in a thorough Leeds-wide Green Belt review it is most unlikely that any PAS site would be returned to Green Belt.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP07896      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

In our list, current UDP Protected Areas of Search (PAS sites) are additionally marked with a star before their LDF numbers. We realise that there is little prospect of any of them being returned to Green Belt during the Green Belt boundary review, despite some of them arguably having been rather ill-chosen; the legal obstacles would be insurmountable. Even so, there is a need for PAS in the LDF, and we believe that by and large what serves as PAS under the UDP should continue to do so in the LDF; such sites would be amber rather than green or red.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP08047      Question Ref: R2      Retail

Shopping frontage policies, though at least temporarily undermined by Government policy, are important in preventing erosion of A1 retail and in controlling excessive accumulations of uniform uses.

Representation ID: REP08182      Question Ref: G7      Greenspace

This section is an audit supported by maps. It isn't clear why some sites are mapped and others not. The most important part is table 10.5.1 which notes current greenspace deficiencies, particularly in outdoor sports, equipped playgrounds and allotments which would grow if population increased without shortfalls being addressed. Land would have to be set aside to deal with current and emerging shortfalls, by reserving land within new developments and by obtaining freestanding pieces of land.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Charles Newsam**

**Representor No: PRS06827**

Representation ID: REP08074      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Matthew Cayton**

**Representor No: PRS06828**

Representation ID: REP08072      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Kate Myers**

**Representor No: PRS06829**

Representation ID: REP08076      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Jane Stackhouse**

**Representor No: PRS06830**

Representation ID: REP08077      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Andrew Shackleton**

**Representor No: PRS06831**

Representation ID: REP08078      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Paula Kellegher**

**Representor No: PRS06832**

Representation ID: REP08081      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Anna Murtough**

**Representor No: PRS06833**

Representation ID: REP08079      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

**Name:** Linda Turp

**Representor No:** PRS06834

Representation ID: REP08080      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08080      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08080      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08080      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08080      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08080      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08080      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08080      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08080      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Linda Turp

**Representor No:** PRS06834

Representation ID: REP08080      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08080      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Linda Turp

Representor No: PRS06834

Representation ID: REP08080

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.



# General Comments

Name: Fiona Oldham

Representor No: PRS06835

Representation ID: REP08083      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

**Name: Debbie Cuthbert**

**Representor No: PRS06836**

Representation ID: REP08084      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08084      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08084      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08084      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08084      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08084      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08084      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08084      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08084      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Debbie Cuthbert

**Representor No:** PRS06836

Representation ID: REP08084      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08084      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Debbie Cuthbert

Representor No: PRS06836

Representation ID: REP08084

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Wendy Fryer  
**Representor No:** PRS06837

Representation ID: REP08086	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Alfred Jennings  
**Representor No:** PRS06838

Representation ID: REP08085	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: Sandra Fenton

Representor No: PRS06839

Representation ID: REP08087 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08087 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08087 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08087 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08087 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08087 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08087 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08087 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08087 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Sandra Fenton**

**Representor No: PRS06839**

Representation ID: REP08087      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08087      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Sandra Fenton

Representor No: PRS06839

Representation ID: REP08087 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.



# General Comments

---

**Name:** Lauren Fryer  
**Representor No:** PRS06840

Representation ID: REP08089	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Miranda Summerfield  
**Representor No:** PRS06841

Representation ID: REP08088	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

**Name: Steve Bell**

**Representor No: PRS06842**

Representation ID: REP08091      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08091      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08091      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08091      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08091      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08091      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08091      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08091      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08091      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Steve Bell

**Representor No:** PRS06842

Representation ID: REP08091      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08091      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Steve Bell

Representor No: PRS06842

Representation ID: REP08091

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

**Name:** Charlotte Read

**Representor No:** PRS06843

Representation ID: REP08093      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

**Name:** Christine Dix

**Representor No:** PRS06844

Representation ID: REP08092      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

**Name: Ron Quarmby**

**Representor No: PRS06845**

Representation ID: REP08094      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08094      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08094      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08094      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08094      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08094      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08094      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08094      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08094      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Ron Quarmby

**Representor No:** PRS06845

Representation ID: REP08094      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08094      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Ron Quarmby

Representor No: PRS06845

Representation ID: REP08094

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.



# General Comments

Name: Liz Worley

Representor No: PRS06846

Representation ID: REP08096      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: Freda Hewitt

Representor No: PRS06847

Representation ID: REP08097 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08097 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08097 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08097 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08097 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08097 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08097 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08097 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08097 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Freda Hewitt

**Representor No:** PRS06847

Representation ID: REP08097      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08097      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Freda Hewitt

Representor No: PRS06847

Representation ID: REP08097

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

**Name:** Mark Brittain  
**Representor No:** PRS06848

Representation ID: REP08095      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

**Name: Fiona Banks**

**Representor No: PRS06849**

Representation ID: REP08100 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08100 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08100 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08100 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08100 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08100 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08100 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08100 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08100 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Fiona Banks**

**Representor No: PRS06849**

Representation ID: REP08100      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08100      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Fiona Banks

Representor No: PRS06849

Representation ID: REP08100

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.



# General Comments

---

**Name:** Holly Monk  
**Representor No:** PRS06850

Representation ID: REP08099	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Niamh Andrews  
**Representor No:** PRS06851

Representation ID: REP08101	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Tony Cutcliffe  
**Representor No:** PRS06852

Representation ID: REP08102	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: Barbara Bell

Representor No: PRS06853

Representation ID: REP08103 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08103 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08103 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08103 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08103 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08103 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08103 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08103 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08103 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Barbara Bell

**Representor No:** PRS06853

Representation ID: REP08103      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08103      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Barbara Bell

Representor No: PRS06853

Representation ID: REP08103

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Eric Nelson  
**Representor No:** PRS06854

Representation ID: REP08104	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Antony Scoulding  
**Representor No:** PRS06855

Representation ID: REP08106	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: A Fox

Representor No: PRS06856

Representation ID: REP08107 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08107 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08107 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08107 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08107 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08107 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08107 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08107 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08107 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: A Fox**

**Representor No: PRS06856**

Representation ID: REP08107      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08107      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: A Fox

Representor No: PRS06856

Representation ID: REP08107

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.



# General Comments

**Name:** Clare Hargreaves

**Representor No:** PRS06857

Representation ID: REP08108      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

**Name:** Rachel Wainwright

**Representor No:** PRS06858

Representation ID: REP08109      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

**Name: Philip Pimblott**

**Representor No: PRS06859**

Representation ID: REP08111      Question Ref: H1      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?

Yes.

Representation ID: REP08111      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08111      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08111      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.

If So, please give site reference and reason

See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.

In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08111      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08111      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08111      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.

No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08111      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.

We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08111      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.

With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Philip Pimblott

**Representor No:** PRS06859

Representation ID: REP08111      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08111      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Philip Pimblott

Representor No: PRS06859

Representation ID: REP08111

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

**Name: Graham Goodman**

**Representor No: PRS06860**

Representation ID: REP08114      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08114      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08114      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08114      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08114      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08114      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08114      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08114      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08114      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Graham Goodman**

**Representor No: PRS06860**

Representation ID: REP08114      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08114      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Graham Goodman

Representor No: PRS06860

Representation ID: REP08114 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

**Name:** Patricia Doherty

**Representor No:** PRS06861

Representation ID: REP08116      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

**Name:** Vivienne Marks

**Representor No:** PRS06862

Representation ID: REP08113      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.



# General Comments

**Name: Simon Banks**

**Representor No: PRS06863**

Representation ID: REP08117 Question Ref: H1 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?

Yes.

Representation ID: REP08117 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08117 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08117 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.

If So, please give site reference and reason

See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.

In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08117 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08117 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08117 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.

No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08117 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.

We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08117 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.

With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Simon Banks**

**Representor No: PRS06863**

Representation ID: REP08117      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08117      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Simon Banks

Representor No: PRS06863

Representation ID: REP08117

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Karen Tough  
**Representor No:** PRS06864

Representation ID: REP08118	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Nigel Wilson  
**Representor No:** PRS06865

Representation ID: REP08119	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: Mandy Drake

Representor No: PRS06866

Representation ID: REP08120 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08120 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08120 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08120 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08120 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08120 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08120 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08120 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08120 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Mandy Drake**

**Representor No: PRS06866**

Representation ID: REP08120      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08120      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Mandy Drake

Representor No: PRS06866

Representation ID: REP08120

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

**Name:** Sarah Savage

**Representor No:** PRS06867

Representation ID: REP08121      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

**Name:** Helen Main

**Representor No:** PRS06868

Representation ID: REP08122      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.



# General Comments

**Name: Margaret Fieldhouse**

**Representor No: PRS06869**

Representation ID: REP08123      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08123      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08123      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08123      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08123      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08123      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08123      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08123      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08123      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Margaret Fieldhouse**

**Representor No: PRS06869**

Representation ID: REP08123      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08123      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Margaret Fieldhouse

Representor No: PRS06869

Representation ID: REP08123

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

**Name:** Caitlin Chatfield

**Representor No:** PRS06870

Representation ID: REP08019      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

**Name:** Gordon Dunn

**Representor No:** PRS06871

Representation ID: REP08125      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

**Name:** Pamela Pimblott

**Representor No:** PRS06872

Representation ID: REP08126      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08126      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08126      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08126      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08126      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08126      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08126      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08126      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08126      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Pamela Pimblott

**Representor No:** PRS06872

Representation ID: REP08126      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08126      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Pamela Pimblott

Representor No: PRS06872

Representation ID: REP08126

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

**Name: Roslyn Goodman**

**Representor No: PRS06874**

Representation ID: REP08127      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08127      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08127      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08127      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08127      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08127      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08127      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08127      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08127      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.



## General Comments

---

**Name: Roslyn Goodman**

**Representor No: PRS06874**

Representation ID: REP08127      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08127      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Roslyn Goodman

Representor No: PRS06874

Representation ID: REP08127

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: Andrea Smethurst

Representor No: PRS06875

Representation ID: REP08128      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: Les Banks

Representor No: PRS06876

Representation ID: REP08130 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08130 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08130 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08130 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08130 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08130 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08130 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08130 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08130 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Les Banks**

**Representor No: PRS06876**

Representation ID: REP08130      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08130      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Les Banks

Representor No: PRS06876

Representation ID: REP08130

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

**Name:** Joanne Mchale

**Representor No:** PRS06877

Representation ID: REP08131      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

**Name:** Kim Barrett

**Representor No:** PRS06878

Representation ID: REP08132      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: Ian Beulah

Representor No: PRS06879

Representation ID: REP08133 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08133 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08133 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08133 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08133 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08133 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08133 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08133 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08133 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.



## General Comments

---

**Name:** Ian Beulah

**Representor No:** PRS06879

Representation ID: REP08133      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08133      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Ian Beulah

Representor No: PRS06879

Representation ID: REP08133

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

**Name:** Angela Grimshaw

**Representor No:** PRS06880

Representation ID: REP08134      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

**Name:** Mitch Blakey

**Representor No:** PRS06881

Representation ID: REP08135      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: Susan Bland

Representor No: PRS06882

Representation ID: REP08138 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08138 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08138 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08138 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08138 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08138 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08138 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08138 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08138 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Susan Bland

**Representor No:** PRS06882

Representation ID: REP08138      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08138      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Susan Bland

Representor No: PRS06882

Representation ID: REP08138

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: Joanne Eastwood

Representor No: PRS06883

Representation ID: REP08137      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

**Name: Steve Cuthbert**

**Representor No: PRS06885**

Representation ID: REP08139      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08139      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08139      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08139      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08139      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08139      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08139      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08139      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08139      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.



## General Comments

---

**Name:** Steve Cuthbert

**Representor No:** PRS06885

Representation ID: REP08139      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08139      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Steve Cuthbert

Representor No: PRS06885

Representation ID: REP08139

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Anna Chills  
**Representor No:** PRS06886

Representation ID: REP08140	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Samantha Clark  
**Representor No:** PRS06887

Representation ID: REP08141	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

**Name: Trevor Fenton**

**Representor No: PRS06888**

Representation ID: REP08142      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08142      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08142      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08142      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08142      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08142      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08142      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08142      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08142      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** Trevor Fenton

**Representor No:** PRS06888

Representation ID: REP08142      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08142      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Trevor Fenton

Representor No: PRS06888

Representation ID: REP08142 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000 Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000 Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025) Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000 Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400 Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: Rachel Contini

Representor No: PRS06889

Representation ID: REP08143      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

**Name: Christine Banks**

**Representor No: PRS06890**

Representation ID: REP08144 Question Ref: H1 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?

Yes.

Representation ID: REP08144 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08144 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08144 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.

If So, please give site reference and reason

See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.

In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08144 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08144 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08144 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.

No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08144 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.

We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08144 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.

With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.



## General Comments

---

**Name: Christine Banks**

**Representor No: PRS06890**

Representation ID: REP08144      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08144      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Christine Banks

Representor No: PRS06890

Representation ID: REP08144

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

**Name:** Joanna Rattray

**Representor No:** PRS06891

Representation ID: REP08145      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

**Name:** Neil Nickolds

**Representor No:** PRS06892

Representation ID: REP08146      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: J Beulah

Representor No: PRS06893

Representation ID: REP08147 Question Ref: H1 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?

Yes.

Representation ID: REP08147 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08147 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08147 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.

If So, please give site reference and reason

See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.

In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08147 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08147 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08147 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.

No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08147 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.

We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08147 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.

With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** J Beulah

**Representor No:** PRS06893

Representation ID: REP08147      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08147      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: J Beulah

Representor No: PRS06893

Representation ID: REP08147 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

## General Comments

---

**Name: G M Patten**

**Representor No: PRS06894**

Representation ID: REP08148      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Richard Walker**

**Representor No: PRS06895**

Representation ID: REP08149      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Chris Johnson**

**Representor No: PRS06896**

Representation ID: REP08151      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

**Name: Nigel Rostron**

**Representor No: PRS06897**

Representation ID: REP08150      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08150      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08150      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08150      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08150      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08150      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08150      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08150      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08150      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.



## General Comments

---

**Name: Nigel Rostron**

**Representor No: PRS06897**

Representation ID: REP08150      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08150      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Nigel Rostron

Representor No: PRS06897

Representation ID: REP08150

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

---

**Name:** Lynn Dubej  
**Representor No:** PRS06898

Representation ID: REP08152	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** Paul Taylor  
**Representor No:** PRS06899

Representation ID: REP08153	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name:** David Illingworth  
**Representor No:** PRS06900

Representation ID: REP08154	Question Ref: General comment	Housing
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: L Hullond

Representor No: PRS06901

Representation ID: REP08155 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08155 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08155 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08155 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08155 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08155 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08155 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08155 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08155 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** L Hullond

**Representor No:** PRS06901

Representation ID: REP08155      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08155      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: L Hullond

Representor No: PRS06901

Representation ID: REP08155

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: Rebecca James

Representor No: PRS06902

Representation ID: REP08156      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: M Davisworth

Representor No: PRS06903

Representation ID: REP08157 Question Ref: General comment Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

Representation ID: REP08158 Question Ref: H1 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?

Yes.

Representation ID: REP08158 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08158 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08158 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.

If So, please give site reference and reason

See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.

In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08158 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08158 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08158 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.

No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08158 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.

We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.



## General Comments

---

**Name:** M Davisworth

**Representor No:** PRS06903

Representation ID: REP08158      Question Ref: H12

Housing

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 references of any specific sites.

With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

Representation ID: REP08158      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08158      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: M Davisworth

Representor No: PRS06903

Representation ID: REP08158

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

**Name:** Kevin Mitchell

**Representor No:** PRS06905

Representation ID: REP08159      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

**Name:** Debbie Ramage

**Representor No:** PRS06906

Representation ID: REP08160      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: D Scott

Representor No: PRS06907

Representation ID: REP08161 Question Ref: H1 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?

Yes.

Representation ID: REP08161 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08161 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08161 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.

If So, please give site reference and reason

See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.

In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08161 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08161 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08161 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.

No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08161 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.

We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08161 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.

With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: D Scott**

**Representor No: PRS06907**

Representation ID: REP08161      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08161      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: D Scott

Representor No: PRS06907

Representation ID: REP08161

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

**Name:** Sara Nix  
**Representor No:** PRS06908

Representation ID: REP08162      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: P Buttress

Representor No: PRS06909

Representation ID: REP08163 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08163 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08163 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08163 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08163 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08163 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08163 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08163 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08163 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.



## General Comments

---

**Name: P Buttress**

**Representor No: PRS06909**

Representation ID: REP08163      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08163      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: P Buttress

Representor No: PRS06909

Representation ID: REP08163

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: Patricia Gwyther

Representor No: PRS06911

Representation ID: REP08164      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: J Clark

Representor No: PRS06912

Representation ID: REP08165 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08165 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08165 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08165 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08165 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08165 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08165 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08165 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08165 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** J Clark

**Representor No:** PRS06912

Representation ID: REP08165      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08165      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: J Clark

Representor No: PRS06912

Representation ID: REP08165

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Val Mcnaughton**

**Representor No: PRS06913**

Representation ID: REP08166      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Nikki Barber**

**Representor No: PRS06914**

Representation ID: REP08167      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Lucy Greenwood**

**Representor No: PRS06915**

Representation ID: REP08168      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Caroline Eastwood**

**Representor No: PRS06916**

Representation ID: REP08169      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Laura Macdougall**

**Representor No: PRS06918**

Representation ID: REP08172      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Joanne Brayshaw**

**Representor No: PRS06919**

Representation ID: REP08173      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Simon Bell**

**Representor No: PRS06920**

Representation ID: REP08174      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

**Name:** Linda Rostron

**Representor No:** PRS06921

Representation ID: REP08176      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08176      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08176      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08176      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08176      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08176      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08176      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08176      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08176      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.



## General Comments

---

**Name:** Linda Rostron

**Representor No:** PRS06921

Representation ID: REP08176      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08176      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: Linda Rostron

Representor No: PRS06921

Representation ID: REP08176

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

**Name:** Joanne Wilkin

**Representor No:** PRS06922

Representation ID: REP08175      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

**Name:** Andrea Walker

**Representor No:** PRS06923

Representation ID: REP08178      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: D Acaster

Representor No: PRS06924

Representation ID: REP08177 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08177 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08177 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08177 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08177 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08177 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08177 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08177 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08177 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: D Acaster**

**Representor No: PRS06924**

Representation ID: REP08177      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08177      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: D Acaster

Representor No: PRS06924

Representation ID: REP08177

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: H Metcalfe

Representor No: PRS06925

Representation ID: REP08179 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08179 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08179 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08179 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08179 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08179 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08179 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08179 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08179 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** H Metcalfe

**Representor No:** PRS06925

Representation ID: REP08179      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08179      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.



# General Comments

Name: H Metcalfe

Representor No: PRS06925

Representation ID: REP08179

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: Anne Bell

Representor No: PRS06926

Representation ID: REP08180      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

Name: C Scott

Representor No: PRS06927

Representation ID: REP08181 Question Ref: H1 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?

Yes.

Representation ID: REP08181 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08181 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08181 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.

If So, please give site reference and reason

See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.

In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08181 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08181 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08181 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.

No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08181 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.

We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08181 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.

With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: C Scott**

**Representor No: PRS06927**

Representation ID: REP08181      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08181      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: C Scott

Representor No: PRS06927

Representation ID: REP08181

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: D Thomas

Representor No: PRS06928

Representation ID: REP08183 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08183 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08183 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08183 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08183 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08183 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08183 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08183 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08183 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: D Thomas**

**Representor No: PRS06928**

Representation ID: REP08183      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08183      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: D Thomas

Representor No: PRS06928

Representation ID: REP08183

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.



# General Comments

Name: G Clark

Representor No: PRS06929

Representation ID: REP08184 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08184 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08184 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08184 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08184 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08184 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08184 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08184 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08184 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: G Clark**

**Representor No: PRS06929**

Representation ID: REP08184      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08184      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: G Clark

Representor No: PRS06929

Representation ID: REP08184

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: D S Tompkins

Representor No: PRS06930

Representation ID: REP08185 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08185 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08185 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08185 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08185 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08185 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08185 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08185 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08185 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** D S Tompkins

**Representor No:** PRS06930

Representation ID: REP08185      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08185      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: D S Tompkins

Representor No: PRS06930

Representation ID: REP08185 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000 Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000 Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025) Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000 Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400 Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: L Acaster

Representor No: PRS06931

Representation ID: REP08186 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08186 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08186 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08186 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08186 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08186 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08186 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08186 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08186 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** L Acaster

**Representor No:** PRS06931

Representation ID: REP08186      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08186      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.



# General Comments

Name: L Acaster

Representor No: PRS06931

Representation ID: REP08186

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: J Metcalfe

Representor No: PRS06932

Representation ID: REP08187 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08187 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08187 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08187 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08187 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08187 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08187 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08187 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08187 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** J Metcalfe

**Representor No:** PRS06932

Representation ID: REP08187      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08187      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: J Metcalfe

Representor No: PRS06932

Representation ID: REP08187

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: D Wright

Representor No: PRS06933

Representation ID: REP08189 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08189 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08189 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08189 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08189 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08189 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08189 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08189 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08189 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: D Wright**

**Representor No: PRS06933**

Representation ID: REP08189      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08189      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: D Wright

Representor No: PRS06933

Representation ID: REP08189

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

**Name: A Thomas**

**Representor No: PRS06934**

Representation ID: REP08190      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08190      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08190      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08190      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08190      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08190      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08190      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08190      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08190      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.



## General Comments

---

**Name: A Thomas**

**Representor No: PRS06934**

Representation ID: REP08190      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08190      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: A Thomas

Representor No: PRS06934

Representation ID: REP08190

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: S West

Representor No: PRS06935

Representation ID: REP08191 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08191 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08191 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08191 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08191 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08191 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08191 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08191 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08191 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: S West**

**Representor No: PRS06935**

Representation ID: REP08191      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08191      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: S West

Representor No: PRS06935

Representation ID: REP08191

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: S West

Representor No: PRS06935

Representation ID: REP08197 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08197 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08197 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08197 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08197 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08197 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08197 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08197 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08197 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: S West**

**Representor No: PRS06935**

Representation ID: REP08197      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08197      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: S West

Representor No: PRS06935

Representation ID: REP08197 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.



# General Comments

**Name:** L Tompkins

**Representor No:** PRS06936

Representation ID: REP08192      Question Ref: H1      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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08192      Question Ref: H2      Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08192      Question Ref: H3      Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08192      Question Ref: H4      Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as `amber` represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08192      Question Ref: H6      Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08192      Question Ref: H8      Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08192      Question Ref: H10      Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08192      Question Ref: H11      Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08192      Question Ref: H12      Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** L Tompkins

**Representor No:** PRS06936

Representation ID: REP08192      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08192      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: L Tompkins

Representor No: PRS06936

Representation ID: REP08192 Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000 Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000 Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025) Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000 Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400 Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: S Walker

Representor No: PRS06937

Representation ID: REP08193 Question Ref: H1 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?

Yes.

Representation ID: REP08193 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08193 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08193 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.

If So, please give site reference and reason

See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.

In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08193 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08193 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08193 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.

No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08193 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.

We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08193 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.

With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: S Walker**

**Representor No: PRS06937**

Representation ID: REP08193      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08193      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: S Walker

Representor No: PRS06937

Representation ID: REP08193

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: J Druce

Representor No: PRS06938

Representation ID: REP08194 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08194 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08194 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08194 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08194 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08194 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08194 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08194 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08194 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** J Druce

**Representor No:** PRS06938

Representation ID: REP08194      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08194      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.



# General Comments

Name: J Druce

Representor No: PRS06938

Representation ID: REP08194

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: L Wright

Representor No: PRS06939

Representation ID: REP08195 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08195 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08195 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08195 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08195 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08195 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08195 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08195 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08195 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** L Wright

**Representor No:** PRS06939

Representation ID: REP08195      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08195      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: L Wright

Representor No: PRS06939

Representation ID: REP08195

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: R Proctor

Representor No: PRS06940

Representation ID: REP08196 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08196 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08196 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08196 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08196 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08196 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08196 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08196 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08196 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name:** R Proctor

**Representor No:** PRS06940

Representation ID: REP08196      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08196      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: R Proctor

Representor No: PRS06940

Representation ID: REP08196

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: C Hullond

Representor No: PRS06941

Representation ID: REP08198 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08198 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08198 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08198 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08198 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08198 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08198 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08198 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08198 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.



## General Comments

---

**Name: C Hullond**

**Representor No: PRS06941**

Representation ID: REP08198      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08198      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: C Hullond

Representor No: PRS06941

Representation ID: REP08198

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: A Walker

Representor No: PRS06942

Representation ID: REP08199 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08199 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08199 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08199 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08199 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08199 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08199 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08199 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08199 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: A Walker**

**Representor No: PRS06942**

Representation ID: REP08199      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08199      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: A Walker

Representor No: PRS06942

Representation ID: REP08199

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: M Druce

Representor No: PRS06943

Representation ID: REP08200 Question Ref: H1 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?

Yes.

Representation ID: REP08200 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08200 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08200 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.

If So, please give site reference and reason

See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.

In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08200 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08200 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08200 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.

No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08200 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.

We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08200 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.

With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: M Druce**

**Representor No: PRS06943**

Representation ID: REP08200      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08200      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: M Druce

Representor No: PRS06943

Representation ID: REP08200

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.



# General Comments

Name: S Buttress

Representor No: PRS06944

Representation ID: REP08201 Question Ref: H1 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?  
Yes.

Representation ID: REP08201 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08201 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08201 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?  
No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.  
If So, please give site reference and reason  
See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.  
In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08201 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.  
None.

Representation ID: REP08201 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.  
None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08201 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.  
No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08201 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.  
We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08201 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.  
With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: S Buttress**

**Representor No: PRS06944**

Representation ID: REP08201      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08201      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: S Buttress

Representor No: PRS06944

Representation ID: REP08201

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

Name: M Proctor

Representor No: PRS06945

Representation ID: REP08202 Question Ref: H1 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?

Yes.

Representation ID: REP08202 Question Ref: H2 Housing

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08202 Question Ref: H3 Housing

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

No, we do not consider there to be any green sites within our area beyond those already assessed as having that status.

Representation ID: REP08202 Question Ref: H4 Housing

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

No, we do not consider that any of the Amber sites have potential for allocation for future housing.

If So, please give site reference and reason

See table below in reference to Site 1134, Aberford Road, Barwick in Elmet. We have provided sound reasons for why that site should not be Amber, and consider it should be assessed as RED for those reasons.

In addition, we consider that all Amber sites around Scholes and indeed the ONE are not suitable for various reasons, be it Green Belt designation, access problems, issues with drainage, local facilities and many other factors.

[extract from table submitted - see full representation submitted]

The notes against this site state that it is in Green Belt, and has no defensible border to the north, which would open up for further sprawl, this being a major concern to us. Allowing this site would be totally against NPPF policy in our view. The description also states that there are "no highway issues". We contest this assessment as inaccurate. The site is in Green Belt and an Area of Special Landscape Interest, and by that fact alone, it should not be developed. It sits on a blind corner, where cars speed out of the village towards Aberford, representing a very real traffic accident opportunity for both cars and children, therefore significant highways issues exist. In addition, the sewerage system along Aberford Road has no capacity for the stated 139 houses as it is very antiquated, therefore "other issues" exist and are not referenced. Indeed a house was recently built in the rear garden of 1 Parlington Court, but its original planning application was for 3 houses, which was thrown out due to sewerage problems and capacity of the network and the capacity of the village treatment works near Ass Bridge. Overall, we believe this site should be rated as RED.

Representation ID: REP08202 Question Ref: H6 Housing

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give site reference and reason.

None.

Representation ID: REP08202 Question Ref: H8 Housing

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? Please give site reference and reason.

None, we believe that all RED sites currently assessed are an accurate reflection of their suitability for housing allocation.

Representation ID: REP08202 Question Ref: H10 Housing

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.

No we do not consider there to be any further sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocation. [see also question H15 - site for sheltered housing suggested on Elmwood Lane, rear of Lime Tree Farm.]

Representation ID: REP08202 Question Ref: H11 Housing

H11. Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state site reference of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.

We wish to reiterate our comments in the introductory section of this response that we strongly support Smart Growth, and believe that any new sites allocated for development in the area should only come forward once ALL brownfield sites have been developed, empty homes have been brought back in to use, all under utilised commercial buildings have been converted to housing, and all stalled sites have been re-visited and the necessary funds injected by Government if necessary to make them commercially viable for developers. On this basis, we believe that the sites identified through this process are very much long term, and only once the above have been exhausted for housing supply. Without this constraint, it is clear that developers will focus efforts on green field and Green Belt sites in open farmland or countryside, as they are significantly cheaper to purchase or secure options on, and are more profitable where no site remediation costs exist.

Representation ID: REP08202 Question Ref: H12 Housing

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 references of any specific sites.

With regards any proposals for allocating sites in the Outer North East area for Gypsy/Traveller sites, we do not feel this would be in keeping with the characteristic of the area at all, and object strongly to such a proposal. We believe sites within the urban area are under consideration, but do not see greenfield and Green Belt land, a key feature of this area, to be suitable for such allocation.

## General Comments

---

**Name: M Proctor**

**Representor No: PRS06945**

Representation ID: REP08202      Question Ref: H13

Housing

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.

See response to H12. above, we do not consider that there are any suitable sites within the Outer North East area, but understand that sites within the urban area offer potential, including the extension of existing sites.

Representation ID: REP08202      Question Ref: H15

Housing

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.

A site within Barwick in Elmet village does exist, and this might offer potential for sheltered housing for elderly local people. This is located on Elmwood Lane, and is a recently sold plot of former farm yard land at the rear of Lime Tree Farm. It is close to existing sheltered accommodation on Carrfield Road and the John Rylie Centre. It would of course be at the discretion of the purchaser of that site to determine what type of development they wish to promote.

# General Comments

Name: M Proctor

Representor No: PRS06945

Representation ID: REP08202

Question Ref: General comment

Housing

This document is a response to the call by Leeds City Council to receive comments on the Site Allocations and accounts for 54 representations from the following residents of Barwick in Elmet. We also request that Leeds City Council acknowledge this document and the number of representations as part of the submission that is given to the Planning Inspector. We formally request that this document is issued to Anthony Thickett in its current form, and definitely not précised by the City Council in to the database of comments, as we have observed previous responses to the Core Strategy have either been omitted or significantly watered down. We wish Mr Thickett to appreciate the extent of concern within the communities affected by the Leeds City Council plans as a result. Indeed, we will also issue a copy of this direct to the Inspector via his Programme Office, such is the extent of our concern on this issue and the way in which Leeds City Council have behaved to secure as much Green Belt land as possible for housing. We have also copied this document to our Ward Councillors, MP and Parish Council, as they have been actively involved in the process of assessing sites and agreeing sites with Leeds City Council planners and with no direct representation from residents who are concerned about Green Belt loss in Barwick, ONE and nationally in meeting Government policy on housing. We strongly support Smart Growth, and would like to see ALL brownfield sites developed, empty homes brought back in to use, commercial buildings converted for housing where suitable, stalled sites revisited and supported to enable housing, before any new land is allocated for housing and developed. This requires therefore, that Leeds City Council take appropriate action to enable these Smart Growth principles to be delivered on the ground, including seeking Central Government funding to support stalled sites where developers are saying they are not commercially viable. We do not endorse this view, as they continue to make healthy returns in a difficult economic climate, and this statement from house builders just does not stack up in our view. They are likely to make more profit from greenfield and Green Belt sites as it is typically open countryside and therefore cheap to buy, and is being targeted by them as a result, a situation we find wholly unacceptable.

Our overall assessment is that all sites identified and assessed by the allocations process in Barwick are not suitable for development, and for the comprehensive reasons detailed in this document and the table below. Principally, as they are all in Green Belt, we wish you to state clearly the 'Exceptional Circumstances', complete with a full evidence base, that enable you to allocate any site for housing in and around Barwick and across the entire ONE area that has a Green Belt designation. Barwick in Elmet is indeed surrounded completely by Green Belt and all sites assessed as part of the site allocations process are Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape Interest, Special Ecological and Geological Interest. The rural village has experienced significant development over a number of years, and as a result it has reached its development capacity.

Sustainable

development is not achievable in Barwick, and similarly across many villages in the Outer North East. We would like to make reference to the settlement hierarchy, and wish to reinforce our view that the classification of Barwick is inappropriate, it is indeed a rural village, not a smaller settlement as defined by Leeds City Council. The Core Strategy utilises a rudimentary measure to assess the settlement hierarchy and the term smaller settlement is based on a population of over 1,500 residents and facilities such as a pub. It makes no assessment of the historical nature and characteristics of places, and in the case of Barwick in Elmet, it is very much a rural village centred around a number of farms, with a strong and ancient history recognised by Hall Tower Hill and the associated earthworks being supported by Heritage Lottery Funding. Any further housing would significantly change the nature of the village, make it a significant sized village/small town, and would have a damaging effect on the place and its strong community identity.

Do you have any other comments?

The majority of proposed SHLAA sites within the ONE are either in Greenbelt or adjacent to Greenbelt. We believe that the Green Belt is protected under NPPF, unless 'Exceptional Circumstances' can be demonstrated and that the UDP for Leeds City District of 2006, revised 2009 and the emerging LDF Core Strategy make no provision for mass house building within Green Belt. We do not see mass house building as 'Exceptional Circumstances' enabling development on Green Belt. As residents enjoying a nice rural village with very good quality of life, we are totally opposed to Green Belt development within our village or indeed within ONE, and strongly support it's national purpose as outlined in Par 80 of the NPPF, and referred to above in our response to question H5. We wish to raise a major concern that Leeds wish to build 70,000 houses, and we feel this is aspirational growth and does not appear to reflect the real forecast for population growth and historical Census data. Equally, when compared to other similar size cities where Core Strategy plans and housing numbers have already been the subject of Examination in Public and therefore approved, that the number of houses Leeds City Council have proposed is grossly out of kilter, and totally unsubstantiated we feel. The following table of data has been collated by Wharfedale & Airedale Review Development (WARD) and clearly demonstrates, using the 2011 Census details, that the Leeds LDF proposals are out of kilter with other major cities. Why?

Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets & Targets in Other Cities

It is our understanding that population growth using census data must be the most accurate guide to population growth in the future and therefore to future house building needs. You would expect Leeds 5% growth to continue and therefore the aim would be to build similar numbers of new properties to other cities with similar population growth patterns. Unfortunately this is not the case and the implications for our communities are severe and unacceptable. The chart below shows how Leeds' targets (and to a lesser extent Bradford's) are much, much higher than anywhere else in England, despite the lowest population growth. Actual Population Increase 2001-2011 based on 2001 Census Results & Proposed New Dwellings in Core Development Frameworks % Population Increase Planned New Builds to 2028 Leeds Pop increase 5% 35,900 70,000

Bradford Pop increase 11% 51,700 45,000

Sheffield Pop increase 7.7% 39,600 29,750 (2004 – 2025)

Birmingham Pop increase 9% 88,000 50,000 – 65,000

Bristol Pop increase 10% 47,585 26,400

Leicester 17% 47,100 21,335

NB: Plans for cities in italics have been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, including the proposed levels of new housing proposed.

These are substantially lower than Leeds proposals – less than half for Leicester, Bristol and Sheffield! Why are the Leeds figures so high, despite the lowest growth in population? We therefore believe that the number of houses Leeds wish to secure sites for should be reviewed and downgraded significantly, and to be in line with other similar cities, as accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. Indeed, we feel that allocating sites now will just open up the floodgates for planning applications on green field and Green Belt sites, when the City Council and Government should be pursuing the regeneration and recycling of brown field sites across the city, many of which are an eyesore for their local communities in their current state, along with bringing empty homes back in to use, and using under utilised commercial building space to convert to housing. We actually believe that this will provide most, if not all of the housing needs for the next 15-20 years.

Where affordable housing and elderly accommodation is included within any development, we are particularly concerned that local residents will not get priority for such housing. This is an absolute, non-negotiable requirement, that local people have access to any such housing provided in the locality over other people from outside of the area.

Please confirm back to us that these comments have been accepted as part of the Public Consultation process on Site Allocations and Options. We are long term residents of Barwick in Elmet, voicing our very real concerns at, and objections to, the proposals for sites in Barwick and others in our locality.

These representations should also be acceptable as written representations for the Examination in Public.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Clare Johnson**

**Representor No: PRS06947**

Representation ID: REP08204      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Helen Baxter**

**Representor No: PRS06948**

Representation ID: REP08205      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Robert Woolfrey**

**Representor No: PRS06949**

Representation ID: REP08206      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Cath Woolfrey**

**Representor No: PRS06950**

Representation ID: REP08207      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Dave Woolfrey**

**Representor No: PRS06951**

Representation ID: REP08208      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Dave Brandwood**

**Representor No: PRS06952**

Representation ID: REP08209      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Vivien Dolby**

**Representor No: PRS06953**

Representation ID: REP08210      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

---

**Name: Alan Neesom**

**Representor No: PRS06954**

Representation ID: REP08211      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

# General Comments

**Name:** Wendy Neesom

**Representor No:** PRS06955

Representation ID: REP08212      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

**Name:** Emma Ingleson

**Representor No:** PRS06956

Representation ID: REP08213      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

**Name:** Jasmin Eveleigh

**Representor No:** PRS06957

Representation ID: REP08214      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.

**Name:** Jessica L E

**Representor No:** PRS06958

Representation ID: REP08215      Question Ref: General comment      Housing

Ensure that new homes are built on 'brown field' sites, and existing disused homes around Leeds are brought back into use BEFORE destroying precious greenbelt around Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Otley.



# General Comments

---

**Name:** Tom Leadley

**Representor No:** PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Leeds does have scope to expand along the northern and eastern margins of its main urban area without harmful coalescence or infilling of strategic Green Belt; the danger of undue expansion of the built up area in Outer South West is that it would push West Yorkshire towards becoming a continuous conurbation, another Birmingham or Greater Manchester, with consequent harm to quality of life and discouragement of inward investment. This would be especially so if combined with uncoordinated extensive development in nearby parts of Bradford, Kirklees and Wakefield.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP08217      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

At 10.3.1 there is a table of sites with unimplemented or part-implemented housing planning permissions. Some of these may have had the benefit of more than one permission, only one of which could be turned into bricks and mortar, so the "unimplemented" list may not be entirely realistic.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP08217      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

No explanation or justification has been put forward for the housing targets in the various HMCAs; it is unclear why Outer South West has been allocated 11% of the Leeds-wide total, whilst A ire borough and Outer North West have 3% each and Outer South has 4%.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP08217      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

In our list, current UDP Protected Areas of Search (PAS sites) are additionally marked with a star before their LDF numbers. We realise that there is little prospect of any of them being returned to Green Belt during the Green Belt boundary review, despite some of them arguably having been rather ill-chosen; the legal obstacles would be insurmountable. Even so, there is a need for PAS in the LDF, and we believe that by and large what serves as PAS under the UDP should continue to do so in the LDF; such sites would be amber rather than green or red.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP08217      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We disagree fundamentally with the LDF claim that there is an objectively assessed need for 74,000 new dwellings within the life of the LDF.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP08217      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

We believe that none of the PAS land should be allocated for housing at this stage; some PAS sites might go for housing in a future five year review, others might be the only sites big enough to take schools and other extensive single uses and should be strategically reserved for that purpose. We recognise that even in a thorough Leeds-wide Green Belt review it is most unlikely that any PAS site would be returned to Green Belt.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP08217      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

If much new house building takes place in OSW, there will be a need for new primary and high schools. High schools need large sites; we believe that such sites would best be found on PAS land, to avoid large incursions into Green Belt. Many sites, especially infill, brownfield and windfall, aren't big enough to take a school even though their accumulating totals of dwellings might be quite large. Everyone should be aware that there is no presumption of housing on PAS land; its reservation is for wider strategic land supply purposes.

See rep for full details

Representation ID: REP08217      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

The logic behind the HMCA boundaries hasn't been set out in any understandable way; it is believed that they were drawn up by outside consultants rather than council officers. We believe that the boundary of the Outer South West HlyICA isn't rational. To help public understanding and coherent decision making, City Council ward boundaries should be followed by those of the HMCAs wherever possible; if there has to be deviation from ward boundaries, it should be explained and justified.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP08219      Question Ref: R1

Retail

At Leeds consultation document para 10.2.1 we note and support the proposals for new local retail centres at Drighlington and East Ardsley. We also support the reduction in the size of Morley town centre; those parts deleted seem to have lost retailing by natural attrition, so the change does little more than reflect reality. The Tommy Wass lower order local centre is a reasonable designation of shops around a suburban cross roads on the A653 Dewsbury Road as it enters Leeds proper, though it might be suspected that one day there will be a call for demolitions to allow a new crossroads to be laid out. Proposed extensions CFSMO19 and CFSMO23 are reasonable in themselves and might replace floorspace lost in any crossroads alterations.

## General Comments

---

**Name: Tom Leadley**

**Representor No: PRS07137**

Representation ID: REP08219      Question Ref: R2

Retail

Shopping frontage policies, though at least temporarily undermined by Government policy, are important in preventing erosion of A1 retail and in controlling excessive accumulations of uniform uses.

Representation ID: REP08221      Question Ref: G7

Greenspace

This section is an audit supported by maps. It isn't clear why some sites are mapped and others not. The most important part is table 10.5.1 which notes current greenspace deficiencies, particularly in outdoor sports, equipped playgrounds and allotments which would grow if population increased without shortfalls being addressed. Land would have to be set aside to deal with current and emerging shortfalls, by reserving land within new developments and by obtaining freestanding pieces of land.

---

**Name: Keith Hewitt**

**Representor No: PRS07141**

Representation ID: REP08294      Question Ref: H12

Housing

Traveller Sites

I would be totally opposed to the establishment of any traveller sites in or around the Bramham area as they do not contribute anything positive to communities and can damage and litter the area.

---

**Name: Mavis Pickard**

**Representor No: PRS07151**

Representation ID: REP08307      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

Pool is no longer a village it cannot deal with more traffic, the facilities are not large enough to cope with more and more people and traffic, it is like living at the side of the M1 but whatever we say the authorities will do what they want! It is out and dried already.

# General Comments

**Name: Unidentifiable**

**Representor No: PRS99999**

Representation ID: REP02203      Question Ref: General comment      Housing  
Green Belt & grazing land

Representation ID: REP02641      Question Ref: General comment      Housing  
The proposal to build on any greenfield

Representation ID: REP04702      Question Ref: H1      Housing  
Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree

Representation ID: REP04703      Question Ref: H1      Housing  
Cookridge needs no more housing development Strongly agree The inevitable increase in local traffic will be a problem Strongly agree Local schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand Strongly agree The area including Moseley beck is prone to flooding. More building will affect this Strongly agree Moseley Bottom is an important wildlife habitat Strongly agree

Representation ID: REP04864      Question Ref: H7      Housing  
Building on land that floods - where is the sense in that!

Representation ID: REP05682      Question Ref: General comment      Housing  
Please accept this email as my formal objection to the development of 373 houses in the Robin Hood.  
I feel that the proposal is excessive and the infrastructure that is already in place would be unable to cope with any further stress upon its already current fragile state. Our local schools are already filled to capacity as well local amenities such as doctors and dentists.  
I feel a project of this size would devalue our area and the proposed sites would only further stress our volatile busy carriageway of Leadwell Lane.

# General Comments

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999

Representation ID: REP05771      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

SUGAR MILL SITE, LAND AT OAKHURST AVENUE/DEWSBURY ROAD, LEEDS LS11 7DF

LEEDS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD: ISSUES AND OPTIONS

We enclose a pro-forma on behalf of our client "Highcross" relating to the above consultation event seeking views on the Allocations DPD Issues and Options document.

Background

We submitted an earlier representation as part of the Call for Sites in March 2012 (letter dated 29th March 2012) seeking inclusion of the site within the Tommy Wass (Dewsbury Road) Local Centre. This was under representation reference CFM019. At that time the emerging LDF Core Strategy identified the site as adjoining the local centre. Our earlier representation highlighted that the centre had very limited convenience shopping provision and was relatively run down in appearance and in need of regeneration and investment. The representation sought inclusion of the wider site within the centre boundary as appropriate for mixed use development including retail, employment and housing.

Our comments below in relation the Issues & Options Site Allocations DPD relates to the 'Outer South West Retail Issues & Options' with particular reference to retail matters (paragraph 10.2.0). We deal with matters below using the 'Questions on Retail Issues and Options' set out under paragraph 10.2.4. In particular we address QR1 and QR3.

QR1 — 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.

Our comments below relate to the Tommy Wass Local Centre (Plan 10.2G) and assessment of Call for Sites under paragraph 10.2.4.

The Issues & Options document indicates that a review of each centre boundary in the outer south west area was carried out along with a survey of current uses. This included the Tommy Wass local centre. The text (paragraph 10.2.2) highlights this involved redefining boundaries of centres to accommodate retail development within centres. The document further indicates that the Council is not allocating sites for retail in the various centres (including Tommy Wass) but by making boundary changes the Council intends this to provide scope to accommodate additional retailing.

In relation to the "Call for Sites" process and comments by officers following assessment of those representations, paragraph 10.2.4 of the Issues & Options Allocations DPD indicates that the representation site is regarded as being located within the Tommy Wass local centre. We welcome recognition of the inclusion of the site in the centre and therefore the future contribution it could make to the wider retail and service offer in the centre. However, we would request that the local centre boundary, as shown on Plan 10.2G, be amended to reflect its intended inclusion in the defined Tommy Wass centre.

In light of the above we would ask that the boundary defining the extent of the Tommy Wass local centre be corrected to reflect the conclusions reached in the assessment of sites put forward as part of the Call for Sites consultation. This identifies the representation site as being 'in centre' and that 'retail is acceptable use pending other planning considerations'.

QR3 Do you have any comments on the 'call for sites', sites coming forward for retail uses within the plan period?

We support conclusions reached in relation to the inclusion of the representation site (CFM019) within the defined Tommy Wass local centre boundary. We request that the boundary, as drawn in the Issues & Options document, be extended to reflect the conclusions reached in the assessment of sites put forward as part of the 'call for sites' process.

We trust the above comments and enclosed pro-forma will be taken into account as the Allocations DPD moves forward to the next stage.

Representation ID: REP05809      Question Ref: H1

Housing

I wish to register my views on the potential development of the Layton Lane Fields, Knott Lane and New York Lane

We live in Henley Close. Due to the position near to the local school, during pick up and drop off times we are often unable to drive down the road or get out of the road due to congestion. More housing will put an even further strain on the school and therefore the current traffic/parking problem.

In order to arrive at work in the city on time, my family all have to be on the A65 by 7.15. Any more morning traffic on that road would result in even worse congestion. Public transport is also under pressure and as we have no railway station at Rawdon the only option is the A65.

Finally the few areas of land free in this area are used every day by this household. Where will we go for recreation if developments take over?

I realise there are other issues that could be raised but the above are a real concern for this household.

# General Comments

---

**Name: Unidentifiable**

**Representor No: PRS99999**

Representation ID: REP06321      Question Ref: General comment

Housing

**CHECK THE UNRESTRICTED SPRAWL OF URBAN AREAS**

The site is contained by strong, defensible boundaries and its development will not lead to the sprawl of this part of Tingley/West Ardsley.

**PREVENT NEIGHBOURING TOWNS FROM MERGING**

Development as proposed will not lead to any neighbouring towns from merging.

**ASSIST IN SAFEGUARDING THE COUNTRYSIDE FROM ENCROACHMENT**

There are no strong natural defensible barriers between the site and the existing urban edge. The woodland block is a strong defensible barrier to the south of the proposed site.

**PRESERVE THE SPECIAL SETTING OF HISTORIC TOWNS**

The proposed development site is not adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or historic park or garden or other features of historic significance. Development will have no impact on any heritage asset.

**ASSIST IN URBAN REGENERATION**

This item is not relevant to the Green Belt Review Methodology because the core strategy policies encourage regeneration within the urban area.

Therefore in accordance with criterion iii) of Policy SP6 of the Core Strategy this site would have minimal impact on the purposes of the Leeds Green

Belt. This minimal impact is in contrast to the other green field and green belt site options for housing allocation in Tingley/West Ardsley.

Representation ID: REP07022      Question Ref: H10

Housing

Expired Planning Application 09/0238/FU. See pdf

Representation ID: REP07022      Question Ref: H10

Housing

See pdf. This site has become an eyesore to the village. It has been neglected and left to decay for almost 10 years now.

There is no way this building can be renovated as per the original application.

The planning application was for a six bedroomed house within the red line boundary.

Any change of use to the land in the blue line boundary would need a separate planning application.

The Parish Council would like know the intentions of the owner of this site before seeing any development of Green Site 31008.

Representation ID: REP07421      Question Ref: H4

Housing

This site lies opposite the Methley Church Side 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 11 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.