

**From:**  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Subject:** PDE00655\_Objection to inclusion of HG2-49 as a site for housing  
**Date:** 06 November 2015 15:35:41

---

Sirs

**Site HG2-49( "Tetley Field")**

I wish to object to the proposed inclusion of site HG2-49 as housing in the Site Allocation Plan.

This site is designated as Green Belt in the current Development Plan and has, for many years, been assessed as inappropriate for housing on the basis of its Green Belt status and the potential for harm to the Conservation Area. The Weetwood Neighbourhood Design Statement referred to, and supported, the continuation of the status quo. Since I agreed with what appeared to be a robust and unanimous assessment I saw no need to comment on it in earlier rounds of consultation.

It is clear from the NPPF that Green Belt status should be assumed to be permanent unless exceptional circumstances apply. No exceptional circumstances have been brought forward which can justify a change in the earlier assessment that the site is inappropriate for housing.

The recent proposal to change the status of the site apparently follows an offer from the site owner to divert part of his profit from developing the site to a project elsewhere in the city. This is not an appropriate reason for a change in the site's Green Belt status. The offer might conceivably be relevant under enabling development provisions in the context of a planning application but is not a relevant ground for irrevocable change in Green Belt status. If the site is deemed suitable for housing and loses its Green Belt status it would be difficult for the City to object to the principle of development even if the then owner was making no offer to contribute part of his profit to another project.

The site fulfils an important Green Belt function adjacent to Meanwood Park and, in its current state, has obvious bio-diversity value. A historic footpath runs through the site and is enjoyed by many visitors to the Meanwood Valley.

Although a line of mature trees currently screens the site from a peaceful and unspoilt area of Meanwood Park, the recent removal of one tree (presumably on safety grounds?) in the same line of trees has allowed housing in Becksides Gardens to overlook the park to the detriment of its ambience. It would be naïve to assume that the existing line of trees will remain forever and it must therefore be expected that any housing development on Tetley Field would come to detract from the rural ambience of this part of the park.

The harm represented by the proposed inclusion of this site for housing clearly outweighs its insignificant contribution (30 out of 66,000) to Leeds's housing target.

Yours

Peter Bonsall

44 Weetwood Avenue, LS16 5NF