

**From:** [Harvatt, Adam](#)  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Subject:** PDE03145\_FW: Proposed Development at Stourton Farm North.  
**Date:** 16 November 2015 10:48:42

---

Adam Harvatt  
Team Leader  
Local Plans East  
Forward Planning & Implementation  
City Development  
Leeds City Council

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

From: Speak, Stephen  
Sent: 16 November 2015 08:11  
To: Harvatt, Adam  
Subject: FW: Proposed Development at Stourton Farm North.

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

From: Dobson, Cllr Mark  
Sent: 10 November 2015 10:27  
To: Andrew Hill; Speak, Stephen  
Subject: Re: Proposed Development at Stourton Farm North.

Hi

I agree, hence the land in question, 1232A not being brought forward in the consultation.

Indeed, I'm very concerned after 2 1/2 years of work on my part to ensure a full and thought through process takes place to see this last minute effort to get it added.

For reasons of drainage & transport alone I would not support inclusion at that location.

I've copied in a senior planning colleague who already knows my views but I've added your views to the consultation if that's ok

Thanks

Mark

Sent from my iPhone

> On 10 Nov 2015, at 10:21, Andrew Hill wrote:  
>  
> Good morning Mark,  
>  
> With regards to the above, could you please confirm if the development is likley to commence.  
>  
> As a resident of Cedar Ridge, information regarding this development has been limited and at times confussing.  
>  
> I refer to a social media site ref "Great 4 Garforth", they have suggested that a development will happen, yet within their media site they encourage "the public" not necessarily Garforth residents, to complete a form for submission to LCC, inserting which amenities should be constructed as part of the development, the same form also states that the "submitter" is against the development at South Stourton Farm (I assume Peckfield) & for development at North Stourton Farm.  
>

> I personally can not see how the development at NSF is tangeable due to the massive infasturacture improvements which would be required to satisfy the requirements of 2,000+ homes. I acknowledge & agree that new homes are required to be built & encourage the construction of public facilities, however, "Great 4 Garforths" methods of addressing the matter in hand, ie the building of new homes, is being sidelined with the focus being placed on which amenities are required, surley they should be treated as seperate projects / developments and not "build 2000+ homes & get a football pitch free"!

>

> I look forward to your reply.

>

> Best regards

>

> Andy Hill