

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Subject:** PDE00394\_Leeds Development plan location HG5-8 school Objection  
**Date:** 07 October 2015 14:22:51  
**Attachments:** [I object to the HSG5-8.pdf](#)

---

183 Bradford Road  
East Ardsley  
Wakefield  
WF3 2DL  
03rd October 2015

PLANNING SERVICES  
THE LEONARDO BUILDINGS  
2 ROSSINGTON STREET  
LEEDS  
LS2 8HD.

FAO Sara Welsh

Dear Sara

## **RE- Leeds Development Plan**

Please log my objection to the following:-

HSG5-8 SAP – Site allocated wholly for school use off Bradford road east Ardsley  
(Church Fields)  
HSG3-24 Safeguarded land Housing  
HSG3-25 Safeguarded land Housing

I object to the HSG5-8, HSG3-24, HSG3-25 section of the Leeds Development Plan  
A school and dwellings in this location will cause very serious congestion from the onset, this area is now massively over developed with few places for recreation, due to recent massive housing developments at Thorpe and Middleton which are ever encroaching on the village.  
The Greenfield site which is proposed for the school is a natural beauty spot, with geographical historical and religious interest, used widely by the local community for recreation and enjoyment and should be returned to green belt status, so that it is protected in the future from these types of proposals.

Your proposal brings the most vulnerable people and places them at risk and endangerment from an extremely busy road area which serves both the M1 and M62, no matter what safety precautions your plans included for mitigation of the risk from this plan, the proposal to locate any school here is absurd and absolute folly, it would be only a matter of time before the event of a serious accident ensued either at the school directly or on the motorways.

The traffic flow on the A650 from the M1 and M62 Motorway will be seriously effected and could not be avoided at peak times.

Further more

Our Government guidance and principles towards green belts and Greenfields in England is forever being put to the test by developers. Our green belt is designated so as to protect from

1. the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another
3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The planned development is exactly the type of development that our green-field sites should be protected from because all of the above 1-5.

Planning Authorities are strongly urged to follow the NPPF's detailed advice when considering whether to permit additional development in the green belt. In the green belt there is a general presumption against inappropriate development, unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated to show that the benefits of the development will outweigh the harm caused to the green belt. The NPPF sets out what would constitute appropriate development in the green belt. Once an area of land has been defined as green belt, the stated opportunities and benefits include:

- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->Providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->The retention of attractive landscapes and the enhancement of landscapes, near to where people live
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->Improvement of damaged and derelict land around towns
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->The securing of nature conservation interest
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->The retention of land in agricultural, forestry and related uses.

The proposed plans to build a school and or dwellings on church fields, together with the previous green belt to brown belt changes of other closely surrounding areas of natural beauty prevents all of the above highlighted points and so they and other developments such as those applied for are not in the spirit of our green field policy.

PPG3 was introduced to steer policy away from the development of large, spacious houses on [Greenfield](#) sites, towards higher density development using [Brownfield or urban sites wherever possible](#), however what is being proposed above by the proposal is in direct contravention of the spirit of PPG3 and all of the preceding Greenfield/Greenbelt guidance.

Nowhere does it say that the local councils should re-grade all Greenfield sites to Brown so that councils/developers can build schools homes more cheaply in the future, forgetting the spirit of the green belt policies that have ever been in existence.

Whilst PPG3 also sought to compel developers to provide a greater element of "[affordable housing](#)." It defiantly does not say that developers and councils can ignore all previous guidance.

Furthermore

I object because this development and others in this area because it

- <!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->Encourages the sprawl of large built-up areas in otherwise greenbelt and green field sites when other sites are derelict and can be used instead.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->Will cause neighbouring towns to merge into one another
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->3. <!--[endif]-->Will threaten the countryside by encroaching upon it
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->4. <!--[endif]-->Destroy the setting and special character of our historic town
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->5. <!--[endif]-->Does not consider the regeneration and the recycling of other derelict urban land in LEEDS.

Thank you

Kind Regards

Christopher G Houghton

Your web site does not work.

I have tried in vain to use your web site to log my objections however simply do not have the time to try any longer, can I ask that additional time is allowed to comment as a result of the errors on your site, I have attached a screen shot as requested below. This is the second time your site has not functioned properly when I have occasion to use it, this is very frustrating.

<!--[if !vml]-->



<!--[endif]-->

Leeds city development plan

The **Unitary Development Plan** is the statutory development plan for the whole of the Leeds district. It provides a framework for all new developments and is used as a basis for making decisions on planning applications. (It will gradually be replaced by the emerging **LDF**).

The Northern Powerhouse

The **Northern Powerhouse** is a **proposal** to boost economic growth in the **North** of England by the 2010-15 coalition government and 2015-20 Conservative government in the United Kingdom, particularly in the "Core Cities" of Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds and Sheffield.

It is the so-called **Northern Powerhouse** which currently provides the excuses, ammunition if you like, for our Leeds developers to steel away our Greenfield sites from under our noses. Our reward being the promise of future investment, more jobs and security, but once our green fields are sold to the highest bidder and built upon we can never have them back, they are gone forever. **I believe that hear in the North, particularly here in East Ardsley it is our duty to preserve what remains of our Greenfields and not shamefully sell our heritage.**

Generally in life it is good to have a plan so long as it is built on good foundation, however for several reasons below I believe the current Leeds city development plan is floored and to follow this plan is folly for the residents of East Ardsley and I for one am opposed to it.

The Leeds City Development Plan **looks at the entirety of the Leeds area** and treats our Greenfields more like a commodity to be traded on the stock exchange. By any other name it is a mass marketing tool, that attractively presents our Greenfields into lots, divided and allocated values by suggesting the potential use for the land for the purpose of selling off the lots. Thankfully this is just a plan, a proposal at this stage and I am grateful that we have the opportunity to object and state our views.

I believe the underlying reason for selling off our Greenfields is reinforced by the daily Telegraph as follows.

#### **The Telegraph writes on the 27th October 2015**

**'Northern Powerhouse' a myth** as region expected to lag behind south in 2025 [George Osborne's](#) plan to build a "Northern Powerhouse" has been undermined by a report that shows Britain's North-South divide will grow significantly over the next decade.

The economic gap between London and the North of England is expected to rise by 94pc to £110bn over the next 10 years, according to a report by the Centre for Economics and Business Research (CEBR).

**London is expected to grow 27pc in real terms** in the next decade to just under £450bn at 2012 prices, compared with a **combined growth rate of 14pc across the North West, North East and Yorkshire and the Humber**. The economic consultancy said this would leave output in these regions more than £110bn lower than London's in 2025.

The Telegraph has resources far beyond mine and here in their statement provides us with the factual evidence that prices for building land will be far greater in the south and will continue to be so for the foreseeable future. This is the real reason which is underlying the proposed marketing and selling off of our Greenfields in the villages of our Northern counties.

The M62, M1 roadwork's currently provide parking facilities for orange and white cones and the installation of Mass Tax Gathering Speeding Cameras, this has been the reality of the past level of investment in the North of England, with little sign of anything else ever actually happening.

In reality then, the only boost were ever likely to receive to the economy in the North of England is the building work to hurriedly build houses as cheaply as possible which means building it on Greenbelt and Greenfield sites, spurred on by a thus far empty promise of massive Powerful future investment,

Question;- how long can Greenbelt Robbery go on?

According to the Leeds City Development Plan guidelines, as long as you plan the robbery far enough in advance and the plan is protracted and complicated enough so as to confuse people! the answer appears to be until the Greenbelt runs out!

Question;-

But then what happens when all the greenbelt has gone?

I thought Greenbelt was protected? I hear you say.

Can someone tell me the answer to this one;-

How is the Greenbelt protected?

Kind Regards

Christopher G Houghton