

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Cc:
Subject: PDE01371_Re: Site 3376 Land off Weetwood Avenue; Proposed allocation for housing in the Leeds Site Allocations Plan - Ref HG2-49
Date: 15 November 2015 15:54:15

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are writing to express our strongest objections to LCC's intention to change the Site Allocation Plan for Tetley Fields (**Site 3376 – Land off Weetwood Avenue; Proposed allocation for housing in the Leeds Site Allocations Plan - Ref HG2-49**). To us, the proposal fails the tests of soundness in terms of consistency with National Planning Policy and justification, and we would like to make the following specific points:

1) When we purchased 8 Hollin View in July 2004, we did so with the knowledge that the Tetley Field site was a statutory Green Belt in the current Development Plan, and that such designation is intended to be permanent and only changed in exceptional circumstances. This meant that from the rear of our property there would be direct line-of-site to the Meanwood Valley, without any intervening buildings, and we also would have direct access from the back of our property to the accompanying public footpath. ***Development of the Tetley field site would thus directly affect our property, and we will oppose this in any way that is legally possible.***

2) The plan to develop the Tetley Field site seems to have been undertaken without due process, and there has been no systematic and transparent analysis to review Green Belt boundaries in this part of the city to justify the removal of this site from Green Belt. There also do not appear to be any exceptional circumstances to justify a change in the Green Belt status of the site. ***In summary, it does not appear that this proposal has been through the requisite due diligence to justify this permanent re-designation.***

3) The site appears to us to perform an important Green Belt function – surely, is has to be an essential open space in this area of the city? Certainly, it safeguards an important gap in the built up area as part of the wider Meanwood Valley, provides a recreational area for Leeds' residents, and also protects wildlife in the city centre. ***We thus feel that we have a responsibility to protect the environment for future generations of Leeds'***

residents, and not take irreversible decisions for short-term capital gain.

4) We understand that throughout the Local Plan-making process, the Council Planning Officers have consistently assessed the site to be inappropriate for housing development. In all assessments the site has been categorised as 'RED' meaning that it is considered unsuitable for housing development based on its Green Belt status and the potential for harm to the Conservation Area and green space value. This surely implies that this should be one of the last areas in Leeds that should be considered for housing. Yet, this confidence has been shattered with the letter we received on 9th January 2015 from the site owners, Leeds Rugby Limited, offering to use the proceeds from the development of the site to contribute to the cost of improvements at Headingley Stadium. This commercial factor seems to be the only reason that the Council has overridden its Officers' professional assessment and decided to consider the re-designation of the site for housing. ***We do not believe that it is acceptable for decisions on 'green belt' status to be influenced by commercial lobbying.***

5) Whilst we understand the need for improvements to the Leeds' stadium, and are supportive of this in principle, we feel that this should be totally unrelated, and totally decoupled, from a potential change in the green belt status for the Tetley fields site. If this is not the case, then this sets ***an extremely dangerous precedent that Councils will simply change well-considered, and professional, planning decisions, purely based on commercial interests.*** This cannot be the way for the UK to protect its environment and green spaces for future decades. Second, even if the Tetley's site was sold, ***there appears no guarantee that the money would lead to the stadium improvements*** being made (or relevant permissions being obtained).

6) Should building be undertaken on this site, ***then 'only' 30 buildings are planned,*** which would have little material effect on the housing supply in this part of the city. It thus appears that the sacrifice of designating the Tetley fields as suitable for development seems totally unjustified.

Please will you confirm safe receipt of this email, and provide a written response to the points made.

In summary, we feel that we have to show responsibility for future generations of Leeds' residents, by protecting the precious Green built that underpins the health, recreation and well-being of all people within our great City.

Yours faithfully,

Professor Edmund Linfield

Mrs Rachel Linfield

Miss Connie Linfield

Miss Rosie Linfield

Miss Leanne Linfield