

PDH00'227

140 Victoria Mount,  
Horsforth,  
Leeds,  
LS18 4PZ

RE: LEEDS SITE ALLOCATION PLANS  
Formal objection.  
28<sup>th</sup>.October 2015

DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT			
To	Action	Info	File
31 OCT 2015			
File Number			

Dear Sir/Madam,

As part of the Leeds site allocation plan public consultation process, I would like to formally make mine and my husbands objections to the proposed development at the following sites:

- HG2-41(formally 4240)
- HG2-42(formally 1016)
- HG2-43(formally 5009)

It is our understanding that the proposed developments on these sites are **not** consistent with the national policy, specifically with regard to green belt. As a council Leeds should and must continue to protect our green belt and greenfields.

The fields and open spaces, which are being proposed for development, are important to us because they are areas where we go for exercise and relaxation. We enjoy strawberry picking and furthering our interests in the world around us, something which we have recently begun to introduce to our young granddaughter, who is also a Horsfordian. One particular concern is for the newts whose habitat is on the old college site(HG2-43). These sites should continue to be part of **Leeds strategic green infrastructure** as identified in the **adopted core strategy**.

It is our understanding that the proposed development sites are **not** consistent with the national policy, specifically with regards to infrastructure. Leeds has sufficient policies in place to address the issues that these developments will generate. Development and infrastructure requirements must be considered side by side.

Development on these sites on greenfields will lead to nearby villages being engulfed within the main urban area and they will no longer be major settlements on their own.

Having looked at the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 80 outlining the 5 purposes of Green Belt the proposals ignore several of purposes and is therefore inconsistent with national policy. The proposals seem to completely ignore "to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land". This makes the whole process inconsistent with the NPPF.

Please keep us informed of the public examinations, submission of plans and potential outcome of the review as we would like to attend and speak.

Yours faithfully,

Hilary Hall  
Robert Hall