

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: PDE03163_Meanwood Paddock Site Allocations Representation
Date: 16 November 2015 08:59:00
Attachments: [PaddockObjection2.pdf](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)

Dear Councillor Charlwood,

I have forwarded your email below to sap@leeds.gov.uk for it to be considered as a formal representation on the Site Allocations Plan.

Regards,

Lois Pickering
Team Leader Local Plans West
Forward Planning & Implementation
Leeds City Council
Tel: [REDACTED]

From: Sellens, Martin
Sent: 16 November 2015 08:48
To: Pickering, Lois
Subject: FW: Meanwood Paddock Site Allocations Representation

Lois,

Can you respond to Cllr Chalwood please. Thanks

Martin

From: Charlwood, Cllr Rebecca
Sent: 15 November 2015 12:09
To: Sellens, Martin; Hill, Tim
Subject: Meanwood Paddock Site Allocations Representation

Dear Martin/Tim

Please could you see the attached email and note our full support for this site being removed from the site allocations final document. Rachel sets out the well researched reasons for their views below and I know that her submission is well supported by the community in Meanwood. We attended a packed public meeting last week on the issue.

I believe we could save this particular piece of land because:

1. It is one of the last visible bits of green space in Meanwood and the setting with the church provides a historic reminder of the character of the area. It would be very sad and very undesirable to lose it forever.

AND

2. It is only a very small piece of land with drainage and other practical issues that would make building on it awkward. It also only offers a small number of houses to the overall numbers. I would like to put forward the widespread community support for the large scheme at the working men's club in its place. It provides many more dwellings than originally allocated and I think would make up for the lost numbers from this site.

Can this be taken as my formal submission please?

Best wishes

Cllr Rebecca Charlwood
Chief Whip Labour Group
Moortown and Meanwood ward

Begin forwarded message:

From: Rachel Fletcher <[REDACTED]>
Date: 13 November 2015 16:04:53 GMT
To: rebecca.charlwood <[REDACTED]>, "Sobel, Cllr Alex" <[REDACTED]>, sharon.hamilton <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Chris Sheard <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Fwd: Site Allocations Representation Confirmation
Reply-To: Rachel Fletcher <[REDACTED]>

Dear Councillors,

Attached a copy of the SAP representation re. Church Lane Paddock sent in on behalf of Meanwood Valley Partnership FYI. Same as below, but attachment probably easier to read.

All the best, Rachel

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

From: sap@leeds.gov.uk
To: [REDACTED]
Date: 13 November 2015 at 14:28
Subject: Site Allocations Representation Confirmation

Representation Confirmation

Please find a summary of your comments below:

Comment Reference: SAP3391

Part 1

Personal Details / Client Details

Title:

First Name: Rachel

Last Name: Fletcher

Job Title: Secretary

Organisation: Meanwood Valley Partnership

Address: 37 Parkside Road

Meanwood

LEEDS

Post Code: LS6 4LY

Telephone:

Email Address: [REDACTED]

Part 2

2.1. The Plan your comments relate to: Leeds Site Allocation Plan

2.2. You chose a. A specific site/designation in the Plan

Site reference: HG2-50

Site address: Church Lane - Paddock,
Meanwood LS6

I do not agree with the proposed use of this site

Part 3

3.1. I do not consider the plan to be sound

3.2. Tests of soundness:

Justified

Consistency with National Policy

3.3. Why you think the Plan is sound / unsound:

Ecology/Landscape/Tree(s): The site assessment states “unknown impact” on ecology. The current site with its sloping grassland topography and surrounding trees has a very attractive semi-rural landscape which if the culvert was opened up (as suggested on the site recommendations) would enhance the attractiveness of the site even more. Thus we consider that this site currently contributes to the local ecology and landscape as an attractive greenfield with a variety of plant and wildlife amidst a sea of housing, enjoyed by many on a daily basis and is a resource to be valued and enhanced as such. Thus we feel that this attribute combined with the others outlined should mean that the land should remain in its greenfield state, rather than be allocated for housing.

Conservation/Heritage: Paragraph 126 of the NPPF requires Local Plans to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place. The site is also known as Holy Trinity Glebe Field and is adjacent to both the Grade 2 listed Holy Trinity Church, Meanwood (south east of the site) and the Grade 2 listed Lych Gate (immediately south west of the site, 100m from the church). The stone wall at the western boundary of the site, adjacent to Church Lane, is also linked to the Lych Gate and is the same style as the churchyard boundary with an attractive triangular stone coping; and a decorative pillar detail at the opposite (northern) end of the field

adjacent to Parkside Green. Thus visually and historically we consider that the field is part of the setting of the listed building and thus should not be developed for housing. It is also a much cherished link to the past when the church was first built surrounded by open fields. In 2013 the agent for the owner stated that the 2 houses already in the field set a precedent, however, we consider that they do not as although it would be better (visually) if they were not there, they are used by the diocese to house clergy (and were built as vicarages) and appear to be designed in a way (though not necessarily totally effectively) to keep the feel of the Glebe field with large gardens and wooden bar fences to their boundaries (more like field boundaries than garden boundaries in style).

Local services/facilities: Local concerns have been expressed re. existing drainage problems on the site with the field often being waterlogged.

Schools: There is currently a shortage of school places in the area.

Highways/transport: Highways have stated on the site assessment, 'Site frontage to Church Lane should provide visibility'. However, Church Lane is a busy road used not only by local residents, but also as a cut through to the ring road for commuters, which has become a lot busier since Waitrose was built. There have been significant traffic problems on Church Lane recently evidenced by the imminent implementation of a traffic calming scheme. We consider that a new access to Church Lane at this point would add to the existing problems and possibly be problematic given the steep change in levels into the site at the Church Lane side of the site; the fact that an entrance to the church and parochial hall car park lies behind a wall adjacent to the Lych Gate by the south west part of the site; there is a popular bus stop on Church Lane adjacent to the site and that as well as descending southwards adjacent to the site there is a significant blind bend in Church Lane just south of the site.

Other: Intrinsic Value We appreciate that sites need to be found for housing, but feel this site has such importance locally that allocating for housing would be contrary to the spirit of Leeds Core Plan Policy: 'H2 (iii) (a) greenfield land: a) Should not be developed if it has intrinsic value as amenity space or for recreation or for nature

conservation, or makes a valuable contribution to the visual, history and/or spatial character of an area' The Publication Draft Plan Allocation Conclusion states 'site is within the urban area and surrounded by residential. Housing development is acceptable in principle'. We feel that the fact the site is surrounded by housing should, rather than be used as a reason to encourage more housing, be seen as a reason for the benefits of retaining the greenfield site (visually, psychologically and environmentally) in such a sea of housing. The views are an important visual amenity adding to the feeling of wellbeing, pleasure and enjoyment to passers by (inc. passengers at the adjacent bus stop and on the bus) on a daily basis, as a beautiful open space, with history, charm and wildlife. The site makes a significant contribution to the character of Meanwood village and especially this immediate area which local residents cherish having lost so much of the village character in the past to modern housing etc. The paddock and the view to and from the church are one of the remnants of old Meanwood in this area giving a sense of pleasure to many residents. Meanwood is still considered by many of its residents as a village within the city and the view of the church across the open field is a much loved view and cherished link to the rural past when the church was first built as well as a refreshing and uplifting view in the midst of modern suburban houses. Another More Sustainable Site/Brownfield First We also think that given that there is a planning application currently in for the Meanwood WMC (site MX2-3) that includes 54 housing units, rather than the 9 given in the plan, maybe this can (if approved) be offset against the loss of the 25 units allocated on the Church Lane site for this plan. We consider that the WMC site is much more sustainable than the Church Lane site, especially given its town centre location, adjacent to a main arterial road and being a brownfield site. All the above reasons, in all the sections combined, show why the plan is not sound in allocating this site for housing and it is not justified to allocate this site for housing. Consultation Meanwood Valley Partnership (MVP) consists of local residents who volunteer their time and skills to preserve, protect and enhance the Meanwood Valley area, working in

partnership with other groups, we aim to improve resources and facilities whilst maintaining the area's great heritage and community spirit. At the 2013 consultation the MVP Acting Chair wrote in representation 'I am writing on behalf of members of the Meanwood Valley Partnership group and ask that you extend the first consultation period which ends on Monday 29th July at 5.00pm. We have hardly had time to digest this information regarding a much loved site, The Paddock off Church Lane, as well as other nearby proposals'. Thus we consider that that consultation did not give adequate consultation for all members of the community. Our representations as outlined here show the case we might have made at that time had time allowed. The Sustainability Assessment Guidance says comments from previous stages were used when preparing the draft. We do not feel that adequate consideration of the approx. 30 objections to this site allocation raised at the 2013 consultation (which showed why this site should not be allocated for housing) has been made. It is also of note that many residents had been given the impression by the Council that the site was not suitable for development at that time and more objections might have been received in 2013 if that had not been the case.

3.4. Change(s) you consider necessary to make the Plan sound:

The site should be removed from housing allocation in this plan.

Part 4

4.1. Do you consider the plan to be

legally compliant?

Don't know

4.3. Why you consider the Plan is/or is not legally compliant:

Part 5

5.1. I would like to take part in the forthcoming Public Examination

Part 6

6.1. I would like to be notified of The Submission of the Plan(s) for Public Examination

I would like to be notified of The Adoption of the Plan(s)

Uploaded Files:

Thank you for making a representation on the soundness of the Leeds Site Allocations and Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plans.

Your comments will now be considered by the Council prior to the Submission of the plans to the Planning Inspectorate in due course. To keep up to date with the progress of the plans please check the City Council web-site www.leeds.gov.uk/ldf. If you require any further information on the Site Allocations Plan please e-mail us at sap@leeds.gov.uk. If you require any further information on the Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan please e-mail us at avlap@leeds.gov.uk.

or disclose the information in any way and please delete this email (and any attachment) from your system.

The Council does not accept service of legal documents by e-mail.

Nominate now for the Child Friendly Leeds awards 2016! Help us celebrate those people and places making Leeds a child friendly city.
Visit <http://www.childfriendlyleeds.wordpress.com/awards>