

**From:**  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Subject:** PDE01446\_Planning at sites Hg2-3(1255B) 234 units  
**Date:** 15 November 2015 13:28:10

---

Miss Debra Jones  
101 Coppice Wood Avenue  
Yeadon  
Leeds  
Ls19 7lq

9th November 2015

Site Hg2-3(1255B)

I feel that the plan is NOT POSITIVELY PREPARED I live on coppice wood avenue and this development would increase both road traffic and pedestrian traffic. Not all properties have off road parking and as a result there is a lot of on road parking resulting in the road becoming like a slalom in places. In addition queensway school drop off & pick up times mean the road can be almost unpassable at these times due to the volume of cars and some unhelpful impatient parking. It is not possible to widen the roads or effect another access point to the area due to existing housing.

Also the plan is NOT EFFECTIVE as Queensway junior school is at maximum capacity so resources for schooling in the area are already stretched so the additional demand brought by the proposed site is unsustainable. Secondary school choices in the area are Benton Park at Rawdon 1.4 miles away or Guiseley school 1.7 miles away. This will also increase traffic into and out of the estate at peak times with that traffic heading onto Queensway, which already has peak time traffic queuing at the traffic calming points.

The only planned entry point to the proposed site is via Banksfield Mount which will be accessed by the vast majority of traffic from coppice wood avenue and so therefore must increase the traffic through Coppice Wood Avenue. Banksfield Mount itself is currently a cul de sac so the increase in passing traffic and noise to residents there would be massive.

Also the distance from shops and public transport for people without access to cars, makes the plan not effective.

The plan is NOT JUSTIFIED as this site is Green Belt land and therefore construction of new buildings should be regarded as "inappropriate" except for certain specified exceptions (NPPF 2012). The guidance makes clear that unmet housing need in a particular area is unlikely to meet the "very special circumstances" test to justify green belt development (House of Commons Library SN/SC/934 dated 10 December 2014).

A planning application (28/11/93/OT) was submitted in 1993 for housing development on part of the present Site 1255B. This application was refused. The reasons for refusal were:-

The site lies within an area defined as Green Belt and the proposed development would, if permitted, conflict with the principles of Green Belt control according to guidance given in Government Circulars 42/55 and

14/84 and Planning Policy Guidance Note PPG2. These state that no new building or material change of use should be allowed in the Green Belt except in very special circumstances, for purposes other than agriculture, sport, cemeteries, institutions standing in extensive grounds, or other uses appropriate to a rural area. The Local Planning Authority does not consider that there are substantial or compelling reasons to justify setting aside the Green Belt policy in this case.

The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed development would constitute a significant visual intrusion into this part of the rural area, in particular, the development in area E (part of present site 1255B) which would be prominent when viewed from Carlton Lane to the north of the site. In addition, the proposed development in both areas W and E (part of present site 1255B) would prejudice the retention of the Green Belt status to the south of both sites.

The Local Planning Authority consider the means of access on the site marked area E (part of present site 1255B) in the submitted plan is unacceptable as the proposed development would generate an additional flow of vehicular traffic through an existing residential estate, which would lead to a loss of residential amenity by reason of noise and disturbance and would be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety given the existing problems of on-street parking within the estate. In addition to the traffic and safety grounds given above it is noted that "greenspace" at the side of Banksfield Mount is much used as a childrens' playground. Increased traffic both during construction and subsequently would result in increased risk of accidents and injuries. There is no reason to question the grounds for refusal at the time of the planning decision and there are no grounds for allowing this site to go forward as a suitable site for development in the future. There is a clear boundary between the developed land and the proposed site. The land is agricultural supporting livestock for food production. Once this is lost it cannot be replaced. At a time of an increasing population it is essential that agricultural land is not taken out of production. If this site is developed the viability of the remainder of the farm may be reduced to a level where the agricultural production is not sustainable resulting in more creeping development. There is evidence of historic ridge and furrow ploughing on the site – this has been confirmed by Historic England to have been mapped as part of their Lower Wharfedale National Mapping Project. This indicates that the land has been agricultural for centuries, and thus this is a feature of the urban/rural fringe landscape character.

All of the above still apply, the area has changed very little if at all in the last 22 years.

90% of the sites allocated for development in the Aireborough ward are greenbelt, i cannot believe that there aren't better brownfield sites in the Leeds area. Aireborough was allocated 3% of the increase that Leeds city council say is required for housing in the whole Leeds area which sounds a lot for an area this size.

Regards

Debbie Jones