

**From:** [Department of Planning](#)  
**To:** [LDF Leeds](#)  
**Subject:** PDE02198\_FW: LCC Site Allocations: Response from Drummond and Churchwood Residents' Association  
**Date:** 09 November 2015 11:10:12

---

Please see below comments on site allocations.

Many Thanks,

Rebecca Clay  
Customer Services Officer  
Planning Services  
dec@leeds.gov.uk  
www.leeds.gov.uk  
0113 2224409

Please note that this is an officer opinion only and the advice is given without prejudice to any future formal consideration of the matter by the City Council and without prejudice to the Council's consideration and determination of any application that may be submitted.

Leeds City Council fully supports the submission of applications online through the Planning Portal. Why not submit your next application online?

-----Original Message-----

From: Helen Pickering  
Sent: 09 November 2015 11:01  
To: Department of Planning  
Cc: Bentley, Cllr Susan; Kathryn Wigger; Alison Larkin; Pat Belford; Helen Pickering  
Subject: LCC Site Allocations: Response from Drummond and Churchwood Residents' Association

Planning Services  
Leonardo Building  
2 Rossington Street  
Leeds  
LS28HD

Consultation on the Leeds City Council Site Allocations Plans November 2015

Dear Sir / Madam

I am writing to you as part of the public consultation on the Leeds City Council Site Allocations Plans on behalf of the Drummond and Churchwood Residents' Association.

Our comments are both general and site specific. They are as follows:

1. Whilst recognising the need for more houses in Leeds, we understand that the housing statistics used as a basis for these plans are inaccurate. This results in too high a number of sites being designated for development than are required to meet the housing needs of the City of Leeds. We therefore request that the number of sites is revised downwards to a more appropriate level based on accurate statistics.
2. Pressure should be put on developers to build on sites that already have planning permission and yet still lie empty before allowing further designation of sites on valuable and scarce green space for more new developments.
3. The Council should address as a priority how to better use the existing housing stock. There are areas near us (such as parts of Headingley, Burley and Kirkstall ) where there is significant housing under-occupation ( Unipol Report ). This is partly a result of students migrating to the city centre often leaving an excess of under-occupied HMOs. These frequently suffer from lack of maintenance and neglect. Priority should be given to implementing policies to revive and improve the housing stock in these areas. Such regeneration could provide a valuable source of low cost, affordable

housing which is likely to better meet housing needs in the city. This is preferable to building large numbers of additional new and usually expensive executive housing on sites in the outer suburbs. These outer sites often lack adequate infrastructure ( roads, schools etc ) to support the communities who live there. New infrastructure development can be costly to the local authority as they often require considerable investment of scarce resources from our cash strapped Council to meet these needs.

4. Priority should be given first to affordable housing on brownfield sites first ( LCC Core Strategy ). We oppose the designation of sites which encroach on Green Belt or are located in areas with scarce green space. The NPPF makes clear that a designation of land as Green Belt means that protection of that area from development is expected to be permanent. Green Belt preserves important green space between built up areas, prevents urban sprawl / encroachment into countryside, protects attractive landscape, and prevents the destruction of wildlife habitat. The Far Headingley, Weetwood and West Park Neighbourhood Design Statement and local Conservation Area reports highlight the importance of Green Belt and non-designated green open space describing it as a significant aspect of the unique landscape and character of this area.

5. For the above reasons we oppose the proposed housing development designation of the site at Tetley Fields, Weetwood ( HG2-49, Site 3376) which is on Green Belt land in a Conservation Area. The development would encroach onto Meanwood Valley Park, a Local Nature Reserve. The site has environmental and ecological significance with its trees and hedges, and it provides an important wildlife habitat.

6. We also oppose designation of the site at Weetwood Manor ( HG2-48, Site 3457 ) as this would mean loss of increasingly scarce forested green space which is environmentally and ecologically important. Additionally there is no obvious access to and from the site and traffic to and from the housing development would compound congestion on the feeder roads to the already busy A660. The development would impact on the local Conservation Area and could also affect the setting of Weetwood Manor, a listed building.

7. We oppose the proposed development of the site on Headingley Hill ( we cannot find this site listed in the plans although an application for housing is already in process for planning permission). Development of this site would adversely affect the Headingley Conservation Area, result in the loss of the last part of historic Headingley Moor, and negatively impact on the setting of the listed Headingley Castle and the local accommodation for older people. It would also mean the loss of one of the last open green spaces in Headingley, an area which has a recognised shortage of such land

8. We oppose the proposed developments on the site of Spenfield House, West Park ( HG1-88, 14/06950/FU). The proposed new housing developments on site are in unnecessary proximity to existing residential accommodation, their design is completely out of character with the setting of the listed building, and the proposed internal alterations and adaptations will destroy the unique character of the old building, particularly on the ground floor.

9. We wish to make four more general points relevant to these particular designated sites. First, significant parts of both Weetwood and Headingley Wards are designated Conservation Areas and the above sites fall within and next to Conservation Area boundaries. Councils are required under NPPF to ensure that that new developments both PRESERVE and ENHANCE the historic landscape and buildings in Conservation Areas. Both wards have a unique historic character, contain many listed buildings, and many aspects of their heritage is of designated significance to the City, regionally and nationally. These heritage assets are described in detail in our Neighbourhood Design Statement and Conservation Area documents. It is a REQUIREMENT that this historic environment is protected by the Council if sites in Conservation Areas are to be designated for development.

10. Second, we would like it put on record that we have a major concern about the CUMULATIVE IMPACT of the proposed site designations on local infrastructure and particularly on traffic levels on the very busy A660 in our area. This should be an important consideration when additional site designations are made.

11. Third, Weetwood and Headingley Wards have a considerable number of large, visually significant, often listed buildings set in spacious green grounds with mature trees. Many of these are seen as ripe for development eg. Leeds Girls High School ( HG1-216 ) and Spenfield House. There is constant pressure by developers who acquire these sites to significantly increase the number housing units within these old buildings often destroying their character and effectively creating large HMOs. This is frequently combined with high density and unsuitable new housing development in the grounds. The cumulative impact of both can bring OVER-DEVELOPMENT, increased TRAFFIC

MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS, and SOCIAL and ENVIRONMENTAL DETRIMENT. We do not oppose this kind of development in principle , however when it is done unsympathetically it can adversely change the character of attractive and historic suburbs. Headingley in particular has already been badly affected in this respect.

12. Fourth, given the very important historic and landscape value of much of Weetwood and Headingley, it is very disappointing that the design of many new housing developments is unattractive and inappropriate to the character of their areas. We ask that the Council is much more vigilant as to the QUALITY and APPROPRIATENESS of the DESIGN of new developments. Until this can be shown to happen, it is not at all surprising that proposed development on many sites in the City brings so much public opposition.

Your sincerely  
Helen Pickering  
19 Drummond Road, Leeds LS165LB  
On behalf of the Drummond and Churchwood Residents' Association

Sent from my iPad